BENARES SANSKRIT SERIES;

A

COLLECTION OF SANSKRIT WORKS

EDITED BY THE

PAṆḌITS OF THE BENARES SANSKṚIT COLLEGE,

UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF

R. T. H. GRIFFITH M. A.,

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, N. W. P. & OUDH,

& G. THIBAUT PH. DR.,

PRINCIPAL, BENARES COLLEGE.

No. 4.

। अर्थसङ्ग्रहः ।

THE ARTHASAṀGRAHA

AN ELEMENTARY TREATISE
ON MI'MA'ṀSA'

BY

LAUGA'KSHI BHA'SKARA,

EDITED AND TRANSLATED

BY

G. THIBAUT PHIL. DR.
PRINCIPAL, BENARES
COLLEGE.

BENARES:

PUBLISHED BY MESSRS. BRAJ B. DAS & CO.

PRINTED AT THE BENARES PRINTING PRESS.

1882.



PREFACE.

The treatise edited and translated in the following is one of the best known and most extensively studied of the elementary works on the Mímámsá-śástra. It closely follows—and in many passages literally agrees with—the equally popular Mímámsá-Nyáya-Prakáśa usually called the Ápadeví, which latter work would perhaps be the most recommendable to the beginner of all treatises on Mímámsá. The Artha-samgraha has however been preferred for publication in the Benares Sanskrit Series on account of its smaller bulk. Its text has been repeatedly published before, in a lithographed edition at Benares together with a commentary and in a printed edition brought out by Paṇdit Jíbánanda Vidyá-ságar at Calcutta. Both these editions are incorrect, especially the latter one.

The Arthasamgraha is by no means an easy book, in spite of—or as it would perhaps be more correct to say, owing to—its limited bulk in which a great amount of matter is condensed by means of the most pregnant language being used. I am greatly obliged to Paṇdit Ḍhuṇḍhi Rája the able and learned Sanskrit Librarian of the Benares College for continued assistance given to me while editing and translating the Arthasamgraha and revising the proofsheets. With regard to some specially difficult points I have likewise been greatly benefitted by the advice of the distinguished Paṇdit Bála Śástrí, late Professor of Law in the Benares Sanskrit-College who combines with a perfect mastery of the Śástras a thorough knowledge of the Veda and therefore is entitled like few others to be appealed to in any question connected with the Mímámsá-śástra.—A mere literal translation would have been of comparatively small value; numerous explanations have therefore been added and the plan of inserting them into the text by means of brackets rather than adding them in footnotes has been by preference adhered to.

G. THIBAUT.

BENARES:
March, 1882.

INTRODUCTORY REMAKS.

An attempt at an exhaustive review and criticism of the Mimámsá-śástra would be out of place here. A few remarks however on its general character will form a not unsuitable introduction to the Artha-samgraha and will, it is hoped, be of some use to those who wish to form an adequate idea of the subject matter of this hitherto some what neglected system. The only longer essay on Mímámsá which exists—the one by Colebrooke—gives correct information as far as it goes, is however not well adapted to make the reader acquainted with the leading features of the Śástra. The current accounts of the Mímámsá found in handbooks &c. merely extract Colebrooke's remarks and are as a rule more or less vague and incorrect.

The beginnings of the Mímámsá may be traced distinctly enough in the Veda itself, the very word (mímámsá; mímámsate &c.) being used there to denote doubt and discussion with regard to points of doctrine and ritual. This early Mímámsá may be designated a boná fide Mímámsá as it tries to decide the points about which a doubt is raised by free reasoning taking into account the circumstances and exigencies of each case without submitting itself to any authority. It originated in the time when owing to differences in tradition, belief, ritual &c. the various Vedic śákhás began to form themselves, a time when the whole religious and sacrificial system of the Brahmins still was in a comparatively unsettled and floating condition.—The later systematical Mímámsá on the other hand—the Mímámsá which is embodied in the śástra—is of a more limited scope, owing to the altered circumstances of the time in which it arose. The creative period of Brahminical religious thought was then past and the spirit of free inquiry and discussion had yielded to an implicit faith in the authority of the sacred books handed down by unbroken tradition. Difficulties with regard to questions of sacrifice and ritual still indeed presented themselves but they were not as of old difficulties arising from the nature of the things themselves and to be re-

moved by an independent and unbiassed consideration of all sides of the question, but rather difficulties originating in the peculiar nature of the sacred books and obstructing the procedure of any one who endeavoured to obey the injunctions contained in them. The character of the bráhmaṇas—that part of the Veda which more immediately concerns us here—is well known and there can be no doubt that any one attempting to carry out the precepts contained in them or—if we limit ourselves to the main point—to perform the sacrifices which they describe and comment on, would soon find himself assailed by numerous doubts and misgivings as to his actions being a faithful representation of what the sacred texts intimate. The description of the sacrifices contained in the bráhmaṇas is so incomplete and obscure, in the best cases so disjointed and unsystematic, so frequently interrupted by remarks and comments on the mystical signification of the sacrifice and its constituent acts that it would appear almost impossible for the sacrificer to feel assured of having done exactly what he ought to have done unless he had some other help to guide him. That such a help existed at a very early time already, I mean in the time immediately following on the composition of the chief bráhmaṇas, is a matter which does not admit of any doubt. We can not indeed confidently maintain that then already books of the nature of the kalpa-sútras or prayogas existed, but at any rate there must have existed from the outset a full and circumstantial oral tradition referring to the proper performance of the sacrifices, a tradition for which we may even, from obvious reasons, claim a greater fulness and clearness the higher we ascend into antiquity.

We may thus assume that during a certain period consequent on the composition of the bráhmaṇas—of whatever length that period may have been—acts of religious duty, whereby are meant in the first place sacrifices, were performed on the double ground of the text of the Veda and of oral tradition, two sources of knowledge which we may suppose to have agreed tolerably well in all essential points. But this period was as we know followed by one in which a more systematical and critical spirit began to stir, a period in which the Brahmins felt the want of thoroughly reviewing and recasting all the knowledge they were then possessing, of proving

its soundness and validity by the best possible means and of embodying it in treatises as pregnant and concise as possible. I of course allude to the sútra-period. One of the many tasks then presenting themselves was to raise the doctrine of the sacrificial performances on an incontrovertible basis. This was indeed a task for which the proper way of procedure was much more clearly defined than was the case with regard to most other departments of knowledge. By far the greater part of the Veda directly refers to the sacrifice and the object to be held in view was therefore to compose treatises describing the different sacrificial performances which should entirely base on the text of the Veda and against which no body appealing to the latter would be able to raise any objection. The difficulties besetting this undertaking originated, as remarked above, in the peculiar nature of the Vedic texts whose object, as is well known, is to point out the symbolical and mystical meaning of the single acts of the sacrifice, not to give a clear and connected description of the latter which the performer might follow with ease. It will suffice shortly to touch here on some few of the circumstances which rendered the task of the sútra-writer a by no means easy one. It is f. i. observed that those chapters of the Veda which refer to one and the same sacrifice do not immediately follow on each other but are separated by intervening sections which treat of different matters. The fact that throughout the mantras accompanying a certain sacrifice are combined in separate sections apart from those chapters which contain the corresponding bráhmaṇa is in itself a source of frequent perplexity.—Again it often happens that there is an apparent contradiction between two passages referring to the same matter as when f. i. the bráhmaṇa-passage maintains that from out a series of sacrificial acts a certain one is to be performed in the sixth place while in the section which contains the mantras accompanying the series of acts the mantra referring to the particular act mentioned occupies the tenth place.—Or again we find that of two actions referring to the same thing the one which according to the exigencies of the case must be performed in the second place is in the sacred text enjoined before the other one.—Or again the reader of the Veda may be in doubt to whom a certain injunction contained in

the Veda is addressed, what kind of man, in other words, is entitled to perform the sacrifice enjoined and in return to expect the result promised in the Veda.—Or again we meet in the Veda with passages regarding which a primá facie doubt arises whether they enjoin an independent sacrifice to be performed from a special motive and attended by a special result or perhaps merely a subordinate sacrificial act which contributes its limited share towards the successful performance of one of the well known great sacrifices.—Or again—and this must have been a point whose consideration very frequently pressed itself on the Brahmins at a time when the various sacrifices mentioned in the Veda were in reality regularly performed—it becomes a matter for reflection and doubt in what manner one has to perform the very numerous so-called vikṛitis i. e. the sacrifices which are mere modifications of the few typical sacrifices and which as such the Veda does not describe in detail.—It would be useless here to continue the enumeration of difficult cases of this nature as the treatise edited and translated in the following pages offers many additional examples.

The continually recurring necessity of dealing with difficult cases of the kind described led to the elaboration of a set of rules under the guidance of which it became possible to give an account of the sacrifice which was of real use for practical purposes and which at the same time could be upheld in every particular as being founded on the Veda. So f. i.—to mention only the principles by means of which two of the above stated difficulties are to be solved—it is laid down that whenever the place of the mantra accompanying a certain action and the place assigned to the action by a bráhmaṇa-passage are in conflict the mantra is to have greater weight than the bráhmaṇa because the former being actually recited during the sacrifice is connected with it more intimately than the latter which is not directly used during the performance.—And of two actions referring to the same thing, as f. i. the husking of rice-grains and their cooking, the one to which the exigencies of the case assign the first place is to be done first although in the sacred text it may be mentioned only after the other one; on the general principle that we must try to find for every individual act constituting the sacrifice a visible purpose by means of

which it may contribute towards the outward form of the sacrifice and that only in the case of such a visible purpose not being traceable it may be assumed that the act directly contributes towards the supersensuous result of the entire sacrifice. In the example alluded to above the visible purpose of the ricegrains being husked first is that thereby they are made fit for being cooked while no such purpose can be discovered if the cooking is made to precede the husking.

The exposition of these rules either directly stated as in the systematical treatises of later origin or implied in the discussion of particular Vedic passages as in Jaimini's sútras forms the bulk of what is called the Mímámsá-śástra and the latter might therefore broadly be defined as a body of rules enabling us to construct on the ground of the Veda a kalpa-sútra or a prayoga (a treatise of the nature of the manuals called prayogas—either actually written down or else mentally conceived—forming the indispensable preliminary step for a kalpasútra which is nothing but a prayoga highly abbreviated and condensed by means of certain technicalities and conventions). It would be a by no means uninteresting task to submit a kalpasútra as f. i. Baudháyana's or Ápastamba's to an investigation of this kind and to show f. i. by a comparison of the accounts given of some primary sacrifice in the Vedic texts on one hand and in the kalpasútra on the other hand how the transition from the former to the latter can only be effected by certain rules of the Mímámsá being had recourse to.

Although the remarks made in the preceding lines on the scope of the Mímámsá sufficiently characterize the matter occupying the greater part of the śástra and point out its chiefly practical character they by no means render full justice to the form in which the śástra was finally elaborated and in which it appears in the systematical treatises a specimen of which is the Artha-samgraha. In this later form the Mímámsá is a systematic analysis of that entire part of the Veda which refers to action, preeminently sacrificial action, of the so-called Karma-káṇḍa. This part of the Veda comprises all Vedic writings with the only exception of the Upanishads, includes therefore the entire Samhitás and by far the greater part of the bráhmaṇas. The investigation undertaken by

the fully developed Mímásmá has of course originated from the more practical questions above touched upon but it takes a wider scope and establishes a theory which may indeed be applied to the decision of practical questions but which in addition has its own independent interest. The chief features of this theory will be shortly indicated in the following.

The entire Veda (excluding the Upanishads) is declared to treat of dharma, i. e. acts of duty foremost among which are sacrifices. It in the first place enjoins certain acts of duty specifying at the same time the beneficial result which attends the performance of each act. If it be asked on what authority these acts are enjoined and certain results stated to belong to them, the answer is that the Veda as being nitya, eternal is authoritative of its own nature and needs no other basis to rest on. The proofs of the eternity of the Veda are of course by no means satisfactory and may if closely examined be reduced to the faith of the community basing on immemorial tradition. But this point really lies outside the scope of the Mímámsá which rather presupposes the eternity of the Veda and consequently the binding nature of the precepts contained therein and enters on its real task when it begins to demonstrate that every part, in fact every line and every word of the sacred texts somehow or other refers to acts of duty incumbent on men. To do this it becomes necessary to classify the contents of the Veda. The most general classification is to distinguish the mantra-passages from the Bráhmaṇa-passages these two great divisions being clearly pointed out by their different form; the systematical books on Mímámsá however as a rule start at once with the more detailed division of the Veda into injunctions (vidhi), mantras, names (námadheya), prohibitions (nishedha) and explanatory passages (arthaváda). Among these five divisions the first place in point of importance is claimed by the injunctions, vedic passages which—their character of eternity and authority being presupposed—impel man to perform a certain action in expectation of a certain result. As f. i. the passage "a man desirous of paradise is to sacrifice" (svargakámo yajeta). Passages of this kind claim an instigatory character in consequence of their finite verb standing in the optative or imperative form, whereby the hearer or

reader is instigated to act. The difference between these optative forms as found in the Veda and those which are employed in ordinary human intercourse is that in the latter case the enunciation of the optative form originates in the mind of some individual person who has the wish of making another person act, while in the former case the instigatory power rests solely in the eternal word of the Veda which has no human mind for its antecedent. If we wish to bring the matter somewhat nearer to our way of thinking we might say that the optative forms of the Veda embody the eternal commands of God; although this would not exactly correspond to the doctrine of the Mímámsakas to whom the Veda is a self-subsistent entity.

Among the numerous injunctions which are found in the Vedic texts we have in the first place to distinguish those which in the most general terms enjoin a certain action or sacrifice and to which all other injunctions referring to details are subordinate. Injunctions of this kind are called utpatti-vidhis i. e. originative injunctions and an example is f. i. "agnihotram juhoti" "he is to perform the agnihotra-oblation." The very limited number of short sentences embodying injunctions of this nature constitute to the Hindú mind the very kernel of the Veda all the remainder of which comprising among the rest the entire Saṃhitás has its raison d'être only in standing in a certain relation to the utpatti-vidhis and being useful to the person who endeavours to carry out the precepts contained in the latter. These utpatti-vidhis cannot be said to stand to each other in any necessary relation and—as far as known to me—the Mímáṃsakas have made no attempt to subordinate them to some principle of unity. It can only be said that the order of the sacrifices enjoined in them is a definite one the sacrificer having to proceed in regular succession from the simpler ones to the more complicated. But even from this principle of unity the naimittika sacrifices i. e. those which have to be performed on special occasions arising would have to be excepted. Nor can a principle of unity be discovered in the results to which the sacrifices are said to lead, as these are of the most heterogeneous nature, long life, wealth, progeny, dominion or, as in many cases, paradise or the heavenly world (svarga). The latter is,

most probably on account of its indefiniteness, declared by the Mímáṃsá to be the fruit of all those sacrifices for which the Veda does not mention a special result.

These originative injunctions impressing man's mind excite in him the desire to perform the action as the result of which the heavenly world or else some earthly possession is pointed out. The utpatti-vidhi itself as a rule intimates the result and in addition to this the general nature of the action by means of which the result is to be obtained, this action being in most cases a sacrifice; but in order to enable the person desirous to sacrifice to carry out his intention the special mode of procedure (the so-called itikartavyatá) remains to be stated. This is done by the second class of injunctions distinguished by the Mímáṃsakas, the so called viniyoga-vidhis, injunctions of application by means of which all the actions and things subsidiary to a certain sacrifice (the so called angas or members of the sacrifice) are intimated. The injunctions belonging to this class are as they supply information about all the detail of the sacrifice very numerous and the discussion of the different principles according to which they are to be combined with each other and subordinated to the utpatti-vidhis is one of the most, practically perhaps the most important topic of the mímáṃsá. The pramáṇas which are to guide us in subordinating the various objects and acts constituting the sacrifice to one another and finally to the central action are stated to be six, of successively decreasing force and it must be admitted that the reasoning by which the relative strength of these pramáṇas is settled shows extraordinary acuteness and an astonishing grasp of all the intricate and perplexing detail furnished by the Vedic texts. A full discussion of the matter will be found in the Arthasaṃgraha; here it must suffice to state a few cases exemplifying the general principles. Above was mentioned as an example of the utpatti-vidhi the passage "agnihotram juhoti" "he is to perform the agnihotra-oblation." With this injunction now we have to connect the viniyoga-vidhi "dadhná juhoti" which as the Mímáṃsakas explain, in reality means "dadhná homam bhávayet" "he is to effect the oblation by means of sour milk." This passage shows us that sour milk is an anga, a subsidiary matter of the agnihotra-oblation and the special reason from

which we infer the stated relation is in the present case śruti i. e. direct statement or direct enunciation, the instrumental form "dadhná" showing directly that sour milk is the means by which the oblation is accomplished. This śruti is justly declared to be the strongest of all the proofs enabling us to infer the connection of subsidiary matter and principal matter; the one of widest application however and the one which must be applied at the outset when we wish to find the link connecting the entire sacrificial action with its constituent parts is prakaraṇa or interdependence i. e. the principle according to which we consider as referring to each other one passage which enjoins some sacrifice in general as leading to a certain result and another which enjoins some special act without naming a special result accruing from it. So f. i. when we read the passage enjoining the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice "he who is desirous of paradise is to offer the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice" we feel the want of other passages pointing out in what way the named sacrifice is to be performed and on the other hand when we meet with the passage referring to the oblations called samidh "he is to offer the samidh" we rest unsatisfied because we do not immediately see what is to be effected by means of the samidh. The consequence is that we become aware of the interdependence of these two injunctions, the particular action mentioned in the latter being subservient to the comprehensive sacrifice enjoined in the former one.

Again after we have by means of the viniyoga-vidhis understood the interior structure of the sacrifice and the successive subordination of its parts to the whole we require, in order to become able to perform the sacrifice, additional information about one point viz. the order in which the several parts have to succeed one another. This want is supplied by the so-called injunctions of performance, prayoga-vidhi. It is however to be remarked that we meet only in very rare cases with vedic passages having no other purpose than to settle the order of the acts constituting the sacrifice. In almost all cases this order of succession is to be concluded from the various indicia given in the viniyoga-vidhis, mantras &c. so that the prayoga-vidhis have rather an inferential than an actual existence. —Here again there are enumerated six means of proof of varying

force by means of which order of succession is determined. The translation of the Artha-saṃgraha will be found to give the requisite details.

There remains one class of injunctions to be noticed, viz. the so-called injunctions of claim or qualification, adhikára-vidhi. The injunctions enumerated hitherto have taught us firstly what acts are to be done, secondly in what manner the acts enjoined are to be done and thirdly which is the order of succession of the subordinate acts the aggregate of which constitutes the principal act. There remains one question more to be answered viz. who is the person to whom all these different injunctions are addressed? who is qualified to perform the sacrifice enjoined and to claim its promised fruit? and this question is settled by the adhikáravidhis. About this class of injunctions too it is to be remarked that few passages only are mere adhikára-vidhis it frequently happening that one and the same passage is utpatti-vidhi as well as adhikára-vidhi. And again we must note that a great number of adhikára-vidhis have a merely ideal existence, as certain qualifications of the sacrificer are nowhere explicitly enounced but have to be inferred from the requirements of the case.—So much about vidhi, injunction.

If we now turn to the second of the five divisions of the Veda, the mantras, the first question presenting itself is again "in what relation do they stand to the sacrificial action? in what manner do they help the latter?" The answer here is somewhat curious. As already remarked the Mímáṃsakas are extremely anxious to show that every part of the sacrifice, every word and gesture are of visible use, contribute their share towards the proper accomplishment of the outwardly appearing set of actions as which the sacrifice presents itself to the senses and they insist on ascribing what we might call a purely ceremonial character, a significance of a purely spiritual and supersensuous nature to those actions only for which a visible purpose can not by any means be made out. The principle is on the whole certainly a sound one as its application tends to convert the sacrifice into a well connected whole the parts of which are subservient to each other, while the too free use of the contrary principle i. e. of ascribing an independent charac-

ter to each individual act would resolve the whole sacrifice into a string of performances of whom no body would understand how they came to be combined.—In the special case of the mantras however the former principle appears to be carried too far. If we consider the point impartially we can hardly deny that by far the greater part of the verses and short sayings which accompany the different acts of the sacrifice can only have been meant to have a mystical, supersensuous effect, to contribute directly towards the transcendental result, the apúrva, which in a manner unknown to man is produced by the sacrifice and is the means of procuring for the sacrificer his reward. The Mímáṃsakas however maintain that while some mantras must be acknowledged merely to have the effect stated just now the great majority of them have the purpose of reminding the sacrificer of the different matters connected with the sacrifice, f. i. of the divinities to whom the various oblations are made. It is clear that the first position is here unduly assigned to a circumstance which is altogether secondary and accidental.

While it is easy to understand why injunction (vidhi) and mantra are declared to constitute two of the subdivisions of the veda and again why the same position is assigned to arthaváda and nishedha, it is, on a superficial view of the matter, difficult to see why námadheya, name is coordinated with the four heads enumerated. The distinction of these four heads bases on the obvious circumstance that the many particular sentences constituting in their totality the "apaurusheyaṃ vákyam" called Veda show peculiar characteristics naturally leading to the establishment of a fourfold division. The head "námadheya" on the other hand does not comprise entire sentences, but only particular words occurring in the vidhi-passages. The question of námadheya is in the Mímáṃsá regularly treated in connection with four different Vedic passages viz. "udbhidá yajeta paśukámaḥ" "chitrayá yajeta paśukámaḥ" "agnihotram juhoti" "śyenenábhicharan yajeta" and it might thus appear as if the quoted passages alone had given rise to the discussion. This is however by no means the case; every passage which contains the name of a sacrifice is equally implicated in the investigation and three at any rate of the four quoted in-

junctions appear to owe their selection merely to the circumstance of the sacrifices enjoined in them being comparatively little known or practised so that it was in addition to the theoretical value of the question a matter of some practical interest to decide what the terms "udbhidá" &c. really denoted. Passages enjoining well known sacrifices—as f. i. "darśapúrṇamásábhyáṃ yajeta" "jyotishṭomena yajeta"—might however as well be used as examples.—The reason now why in all such passages particular words like "udbhidá" "darśapúrṇamásábhyám" are singled out as belonging to a special subdivision of the Veda is as follows. According to the theory repeatedly alluded to in the above all the parts of the Veda must be shown to be connected with the action or energy (the so called árthí bhávaná) roused in the believer by the injunctive passages. This energy requires a result towards which it tends, an instrument whereby to realize the result and the indication of the particular way of procedure. The last named demand is satisfied by the many subsidiary injunctions, as stated above. The instrument is implicitly mentioned in the utpattividhis and is in fact the sacrifice itself, the verb "yajeta" having to be interpreted as meaning "yágena bhávayet" "he is to effect or realize by means of the sacrifice", the object to be effected being the result of the sacrifice. If we therefore transform the first of the above quoted passages in the same manner we get the following sentence "udbhidá yágena paśum bhávayet", in which the word "paśum" indicates the result while "yágena" denotes the instrument. Thus—various hypotheses on which the word "udbhidá" might be put in connection with the bhávaná having been disproved—there remains no other course but to declare that it merely serves to define or to limit the idea expressed by the word "yágena", is merely a name and as such occupies a position by itself, which entitles it to be considered as belonging to a special subdivision of the Vedic texts. The same reasoning applies to the other passages quoted.—I feel not quite sure whether this subtle distinction is really defensible or necessary but at any rate it is a striking proof of the thoroughness with which the Mímáṃsakas have carried out their analysis of the Veda.

The fourth subdivision of the Veda, viz. nishedha, prohibition may be left undiscussed here, as its subject matter is not of prima-

ry importance. It is of course intimately connected with vidhi, injunction (many nishedhas being in fact only disguised vidhis) and it is therefore unnecessary to dwell on the position it occupies in the Veda.

Arthaváda, explanatory statement forms the last of the five subdivisions of the Veda adopted by the Mímáṃsá. The translation of arthaváda by "explanatory statement" is not quite adequate, as arthaváda is defined as comprising all those sentences which either contain a praise of the things enjoined (by vidhi) or a blame of the things prohibited (by nishedha). These passages can not be maintained to be directly connected with the above mentioned árthí bhávaná, as the whole action enjoined by vidhi is carried out without any help from the arthaváda sentences, but they occupy a definite position with regard to the so-called śábdí bhávaná, i. e. the energy inherent in vidhi-passages by which the latter are able to impress man's mind and make him act. For the special mode in which the śábdí bhávaná acts (its itikartavyatá) is expressed in the arthaváda-passages, man being on one hand impelled to perform an action when he hears it praised and glorified and on the other hand feeling disinclined to do things which others reprehend and object to.

It is thereby shown that every part of the Veda somehow or other contributes towards dharma and the task of the Mímáṃsá is thus fulfilled. It will at the same time appear that a theoretical inquiry of this kind into the nature of the Veda satisfies all practical requirements as well; for if the logical connection in which the sentences of the Veda stand to each other is understood the proper way of procedure for him who wishes to act on the precepts of the Veda can no longer be doubtful.

The above remarks have left many interesting points unnoticed, so f. i. the doctrine of the eternity of sound, the doctrine of the different pramáṇas &c. A more detailed account of the system I hope to publish in another place. The Mímáṃsá certainly deserves greater attention than it has hitherto received. It has indeed none of the attractions which the other darśanas derive from the speculative character of their contents; its scope is limited and the nature of the investigations in which it is engaged

leaves no room for high flights of the imagination. But it possesses counterbalancing advantages. Its subject matter is of a positive nature, its method is sound and its reasoning in most cases convincing.

अर्थसङ्ग्रहः।

श्रीगणेशाय नमः।

वासुदेवं रमाकान्तं नत्वा लौगाक्षिभास्करः।
कुरुते जैमिनिनये प्रवेशायार्थसंग्रहम् ॥ १ ॥

अथ परमकारुणिको भगवान् जैमिनिर्धर्मविवेकाय द्वादशलक्षणीं प्रणिनाय। तत्रादौ धर्मजिज्ञासां सूत्रयामास अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासेति। अत्राथशब्दो वेदाध्ययनानन्तर्य्यवचनः। अतःशब्दो हि वेदाध्ययनस्य दृष्टार्थत्वं ब्रूते। स्वाध्यायो ऽध्येतव्य इत्यध्ययनविधौ तदध्ययनस्यार्थज्ञानरूपदृष्टार्थकत्वेन व्यवस्थापनात्। तथा च वेदाध्ययनानन्तरं यतो ऽर्थज्ञानरूपदृष्टार्थकं तदध्ययनमतो हेतोर्धर्मस्य वेदार्थस्य जिज्ञासा कर्तव्येति शेषः। जिज्ञासापदस्य विचारे लक्षणा। अतो धर्मविचारशास्त्रमिदमारम्भणीयमिति शास्त्रारम्भसूत्रार्थः ॥ १ ॥

अथ को धर्मः किं तस्य लक्षणमिति चेदुच्यते। यागादिरेव धर्मः। तल्लक्षणं वेदप्रतिपाद्यः प्रयोजनवदर्थो धर्म इति। प्रयोजने ऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय प्रयोजनवदिति। भोजनादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय वेदप्रतिपाद्य इति। अनर्थफलकत्वादनर्थभूते श्येनादावतिव्याप्तिवारणायार्थ इति। न च चोदनालक्षणो ऽर्थो धर्म इति सौत्रतल्लक्षणविरोधः चोदनापदस्य विधिरूपवेदैकदेशपरत्वादिति वाच्यम्। तत्रापि चोदनाशब्दस्य वेदमात्रपरत्वात्। वेदस्य सर्वस्य धर्मतात्पर्यवत्त्वेन धर्मप्रतिपादकत्वात् ॥

स च यागादिर्यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्यादिवाक्येन स्वर्गमुद्दिश्य
पुरुषं प्रति विधीयते। तथा हि। यजेतेत्यत्रास्त्यंशद्वयं यजिधातुः
प्रत्ययश्च। प्रत्यये ऽप्यस्त्यंशद्वयमाख्यातत्वं लिङ्त्वं च। तत्राख्या-
तत्वं दशलकारसाधारणं लिङ्त्वं पुनर्लिङ्मात्रे। उभाभ्याम-
प्यंशाभ्यां भावनैवोच्यते। भावना नाम भवितुर्भवनानुकूलो
भावयितुर्व्यापारविशेषः। सा द्विधा (१) शाब्दी भावना आर्थी (२)
भावना चेति। तत्र पुरुषप्रवृत्त्यनुकूलो भावयितुर्व्यापारविशेषः
शाब्दी भावना। सा च लिङंशेनोच्यते। लिङ्श्रवणे ऽयं मां प्र-
वर्त्तयति मत्प्रवृत्त्यनुकूलव्यापारवानिति नियमेन प्रतीतेः। य-
द्यस्माच्छब्दान्नियमतः प्रतीयते तत्तस्य वाच्यम्। यथा गामानये-
त्यस्मिन्वाक्ये गोशब्दस्य गोत्वम्। स च व्यापारविशेषो लौकि-
कवाक्ये पुरुषनिष्ठो ऽभिप्रायविशेषः। वैदिकवाक्ये तु पुरुषा-
भावाल्लिङादिशब्दनिष्ठ एव। अत एव शाब्दी भावनेति
व्यवह्रियते। सा च भावनांशत्रयमपेक्षते साध्यं साधन-
मितिकर्त्तव्यतां च किं भावयेत्केन भावयेत्कथं भावयेदिति।
तत्र साध्याकाङ्क्षायां वक्ष्यमाणांशत्रयोपेता आर्थी भावना
साध्यत्वेनान्वेति। एकप्रत्ययगम्यत्वेन समानाभिधानश्रुतेः। सं-
ख्यादीनामेकप्रत्ययगम्यत्वे ऽप्ययोग्यत्वान्न साध्यत्वेनान्वयः।
साधनाकाङ्क्षायां लिङादिज्ञानं करणत्वेनान्वेति। तस्य च क-
रणत्वं (३) न भावनोत्पादकत्वेन तत्पूर्वमपि तस्याः शब्दे सत्त्वा-

(१) ख ग पुस्तकयोः द्विविधा।
(२) ख घ पुस्तकयोः शब्दभावना अर्थभा०।
(३) तस्य च भावनायां करणत्वमिति पाठः ख पुस्तके।

त्। किं तु भावनाज्ञापकत्वेन शब्दभावनाभाव्यनिर्वर्त्तकत्वेन
वा। इतिकर्त्तव्यताकाङ्क्षायामर्थवादज्ञाप्यप्राशस्त्यमितिकर्त्त-
व्यतात्वेनान्वेति। प्रयोजनेच्छाजनितक्रियाविषयव्यापार आर्थी
भावना। सा चाख्यातत्वांशेनोच्यते। आख्यातसामान्यस्य व्या-
पारवाचित्वात्। साप्यंशत्रयमपेक्षते साध्यं साधनमितिकर्त्तव्य-
तां च किं भावयेत्केन भावयेत्कथं भावयेदिति। तत्र साध्या-
काङ्क्षायां स्वर्गादि फलं साध्यत्वेनान्वेति। साधनाकाङ्क्षायां
यागादिः करणत्वेनान्वेति। इतिकर्त्तव्यताकाङ्क्षायां प्रयाजाद्य-
ङ्गजातमितिकर्त्तव्यतात्वेनान्वेति॥

अथ को वेद इति चेदुच्यते। अपौरुषेयं वाक्यं वेदः। स च
विधिमन्त्रनामधेयनिषेधार्थवादभेदात्पञ्चविधः॥

तत्राज्ञातार्थज्ञापको वेदभागो विधिः। स च तादृश (१) प्र-
योजनवदर्थविधानेनार्थवान् यादृशं चार्थं प्रमाणान्तरेणाप्राप्तं
विधत्ते। यथा ऽग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्स्वर्गकाम इति विधिर्मानान्त-
रेणाप्राप्तं स्वर्गप्रयोजनवद्धोमं विधत्ते। अग्निहोत्रहोमेन स्वर्गं
भावयेदिति वाक्यार्थबोधः। यत्र कर्म मानान्तरेण प्राप्तं तत्र त-
दुद्देशेन गुणमात्रं विधत्ते। यथा दध्ना जुहोतीत्यत्र होमस्याग्नि-
होत्रं जुहुयादित्यनेन प्राप्तत्वाद्धोमोद्देशेन दधिमात्रविधानम्।
दध्ना होमं भावयेदिति। यत्र तूभयमप्राप्तं तत्र विशिष्टं विधत्ते
यथा सोमेन यजेतेत्यत्र सोमयागयोरप्राप्तत्वात्सोमविशिष्टया-
गविधानम्। सोमपदे मत्त्वर्थलक्षणया सोमवता यागेनेष्टं भावये-
दिति वाक्यार्थबोधः। न चोभयविधाने वाक्यभेदः। प्रत्येकमुभय-

(१) स च प्रयोजनेति पाठः ख ग पुस्तकयोः।

स्याविधानात् किं तु विशिष्टस्यैकस्यैव विधानात्। न च "ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेते"ति विधिप्राप्तयागोद्देशेन सोमरूपगुणविधानमेवास्तु सोमेन यागं भावयेदिति किं मत्त्वर्थलक्षणयेति वाच्यम्। तस्याधिकारविधित्वेनोत्पत्तिविधित्वासंभवात्। ननूद्भिदा यजेत पशुकाम इत्यस्येव ज्योतिष्टोमेनेत्यस्याप्युत्पत्त्यधिकारविधित्वमस्त्विति चेन्न। दृष्टान्त उत्पत्तिवाक्यान्तराभावेन अन्यथानुपपत्त्या तथात्वाश्रयणात्। किं च ज्योतिष्टोमेनेत्यस्योभयविधित्वे ऽनेनैव यागस्तस्य फलसंबन्धो ऽपि बोधनीय इति सुदृढो वाक्यभेदस्तद्वरं सोमपदे मत्त्वर्थलक्षणया विशिष्टविधानम्॥

विधिश्चतुर्विधः। उत्पत्तिविधिर्विनियोगविधिरधिकारविधिः प्रयोगविधिश्चेति॥

तत्र कर्मस्वरूपमात्रबोधको विधिरुत्पत्तिविधिः। यथा ऽग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति। अत्र विधौ कर्मणः करणत्वेनान्वयः। अग्निहोत्रहोमेनेष्टं भावयेदिति। ननु यागस्य द्वे रूपे द्रव्यं देवता च। तथा च रूपाश्रवणे अग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति कथमुत्पत्तिविधिः। अग्निहोत्रशब्दस्य तु तत्प्रख्यन्यायेन नामधेयत्वादिति चेन्न। रूपाश्रवणे ऽप्यस्योत्पत्तिविधित्वात्। अन्यथा रूपश्रवणाद्दध्ना जुहोतीत्ययमेवोत्पत्तिविधिः स्यात्। तथा चाग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति वाक्यमनर्थकं स्यात्॥

अङ्गप्रधानसंबन्धबोधको विधिर्विनियोगविधिः। यथा दध्ना जुहोतीति। स हि तृतीयया प्रतिपन्नाङ्गभावस्य दध्नो होमसंबन्धं विधत्ते। दध्ना होमं भावयेदिति। गुणविधौ च धात्वर्थस्य

साध्यत्वेनान्वयः। क्वचिदाश्रयत्वेनापि। यथा दध्नेन्द्रियकामस्य जुहुयादित्यत्र दधिकरणत्वेनेन्द्रियं भावयेत्। तच्च किंनिष्ठमित्याकाङ्क्षायां सन्निधिप्राप्तहोम आश्रयत्वेनान्वेति॥

एतस्य विधेः सहकारिभूतानि षट् प्रमाणानि। श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यारूपाणि। एतत्सहकृतेनानेन विधिनाङ्गत्वं परोद्देशप्रवृत्तकृतिसाध्यत्वरूपं (१) पारार्थ्यापरपर्य्यायं ज्ञाप्यते॥

तत्र निरपेक्षो रवः श्रुतिः। सा च त्रिविधा। विधात्री अभिधात्री विनियोक्त्री च। तत्राद्या लिङाद्यात्मिका। द्वितीया व्रीह्यादिश्रुतिः। यस्य च शब्दस्य श्रवणादेव संबन्धः प्रतीयते सा विनियोक्त्री। सापि त्रिविधा विभक्तिरूपा एकाभिधानरूपा एकपदरूपा चेति। तत्र विभक्तिश्रुत्या अङ्गत्वम्। यथा व्रीहिभिर्यजेतेति तृतीयाश्रुत्या व्रीहीणां यागाङ्गत्वम्। तदपि पुरोडाशप्रकृतितया। यथा पशोर्हृदयादिरूपहविष्प्रकृतितया यागाङ्गत्वम्। अरुणया एकहायन्या गवा सोमं क्रीणातीत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये आरुण्यस्यापि तृतीयाश्रुत्या क्रयाङ्गत्वम्। तदपि गोरूपद्रव्यपरिच्छेदद्वारा न तु साक्षात्। अमूर्त्तत्वात्। व्रीहीन्प्रोक्षतीति प्रोक्षणस्य व्रीह्यङ्गत्वं द्वितीयाश्रुत्या। तच्च प्रोक्षणं न व्रीहिस्वरूपार्थम्। तस्य तेन विनाप्युपपत्तेः। किं त्वपूर्वसाधनत्वप्रयुक्तम्। व्रीहीनप्रोक्ष्य यागानुष्ठाने ऽपूर्वानुपपत्तेः। एवं सर्वेष्वङ्गेष्वपूर्वप्रयुक्तमङ्गत्वं बोध्यम्। एवमिमामगृभ्णन्रशनामृतस्येत्यश्वाभिधानीमादत्त इत्यत्र द्वितीयया श्रुत्या मन्त्रस्याश्वाभि-

(१) रूपं यागादिकमिति ख ग पुस्तकयोः।

धान्यङ्गत्वम्। यदाहवनीये जुहोतीत्याहवनीयस्य होमाङ्गत्वं सप्तमीश्रुत्या। एवमन्यो ऽपि विभक्तिश्रुत्या विनियोगो ज्ञेयः। पशुना यजेतेत्यत्रैकत्वपुंस्त्वयोः समानाभिधानश्रुत्या कारकाङ्गत्वम्। यजेतेत्याख्याताभिहितसंख्याया आर्थभावनाङ्गत्वं (१) समानाभिधानश्रुतेरेक (२) पदश्रुत्या च यागाङ्गत्वम्। न चामूर्त्तायास्तस्याः कथं भावनाङ्गत्वं वाच्यम्। कर्त्तृपरिच्छेदद्वारा तदुपपत्तेः। कर्त्ता चाक्षेपलभ्यः। आख्यातेन हि भावनोच्यते। सा च कर्तारं विनानुपपन्नेति तमाक्षिपति। सेयं श्रुतिर्लिङ्गादिभ्यः प्रबला। लिङ्गादिषु न प्रत्यक्षो विनियोजकः शब्दो ऽस्ति किं तु कल्प्यो, यावच्च तैर्विनियोजकः(३) कल्प्यते तावत्प्रत्यक्षया श्रुत्या विनियोगस्य कृतत्वेन तेषां कल्पकत्वशक्तेर्व्याहतत्वात्। अत एवैन्द्र्या लिङ्गान्नेन्द्रोपस्थानार्थत्वम्। किं तु ऐन्द्र्या गार्हपत्यमुपतिष्ठतइत्यत्र गार्हपत्यमिति द्वितीयाश्रुत्या गार्हपत्योपस्थानार्थत्वम्॥

शब्दसामर्थ्यं लिङ्गम्। यथाहुः। सामर्थ्यं सर्वशब्दानां लिङ्गमित्यभिधीयते। सामर्थ्यं रूढिरेव। तेन समाख्यातो नाभेदः। यौगिकशब्दसमाख्यातो रूढ्यात्मकलिङ्गशब्दस्य भिन्नत्वात्। (४) तेन बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामीति मन्त्रस्य कुशलवनाङ्गत्वं न तृणपादिलवनाङ्गत्वम्। तस्य बर्हिर्दामीतिलिङ्गात्तल्लवनं प्रका-

(१) संख्याया आर्थीभावना० इति पाठः क पुस्तके।

(२) श्रुतेरेव। पदश्रुत्येति पाठः ख ग घ पुस्तुकेषु।

(३) कः शब्द इति ग घ पुस्तकयोः।

(४) यौगिकेत्यारभ्य भिन्नत्वादित्यन्तो ग्रन्थः ख ग पुस्तकयोर्नोपलभ्यते।

शयितुं समर्थत्वात्। एवमन्यत्रापि लिङ्गाद्विनियोगो द्रष्टव्यः। तदिदं लिङ्गं वाक्यादिभ्यो बलवत्। अत एव स्योनं ते सदनं कृणोमीति मन्त्रस्य पुरोडाशसदनकरणाङ्गत्वं। सदनं कृणोमीति लिङ्गात् न तु वाक्यात्॥

समभिव्याहारो वाक्यम्। समभिव्याहारश्च साध्यत्वादिवाचकद्वितीयाद्यभावे ऽपि वस्तुतः शेषशेषिवाचकपदयोः सहोच्चारणम्। यथा यस्य पर्णमयी जुहूर्भवति न स पापं श्लोकं शृणोतीत्यत्र पर्णताजुह्वोः समभिव्याहारादेव पर्णताया जुह्वङ्गत्वम्। न चानर्थक्यम्, अन्यथापि जुह्वाः सिद्धत्वादिति वाच्यम्। जुहूशब्देन तत्साध्यापूर्वलक्षणात्। तथा च वाक्यार्थः। पर्णतया ऽवत्तहविर्धारणद्वारा जुह्वपूर्वं भावयेदिति। एवं च पर्णतया यदि जुहूः क्रियते तदैव तत्साध्यमपूर्वं भवति नान्यथेति गम्यतइति न पर्णताया वैयर्थ्यम्(१)। अवत्तहविर्धारणद्वारेति चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्। अन्यथा स्रुवादिष्वपि पर्णतापत्तेः। सेयं पर्णता अनारभ्याधीतापि सर्वप्रकृतिष्वेवान्वेति न विकृतिषु। तत्र चोदकेनापि तत्प्राप्तिसंभवात्पौनरुक्त्यापत्तेः। यत्र समग्राङ्गोपदेशः सा प्रकृतिः। यथा दर्शपूर्णमासादिः। तत्प्रकरणे सर्वाङ्गपाठात्। यत्र न सर्वाङ्गोपदेशः सा विकृतिः। यथा सौर्यादिः। तत्र कतिपयाङ्गानामतिदेशेन प्राप्तत्वात्। अनारभ्यविधिः समान्यविधिः। तदिदं वाक्यं प्रकरणादिभ्यो बलवत्। अत एवेन्द्राग्नी इदं हविरित्यादेरेकवाक्यत्वाद्दर्शाङ्गत्वं न तु प्रकरणाद्दर्शपूर्णमासाङ्गत्वम्॥

(१) एवं चेत्यारभ्य वैयर्थ्यमित्यन्तः पाठो घ पुस्तके उपलभ्यते।

उभयाकाङ्क्षा प्रकरणम्। यथा प्रयाजादिषु समिधो यजतीत्यादौ वाक्ये फलविशेषस्यानिर्देशात् समिद्यागेन भावयेदिति बोधानन्तरं किमिति उपकार्याकाङ्क्षा। दर्शपूर्णमासवाक्येऽपि दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गं भावयेदिति बोधानन्तरं कथमित्युपकारकाकाङ्क्षा॥ इत्थं चोभयाकाङ्क्षया प्रयाजादीनां दर्शपूर्णमासाङ्गत्वम्। तच्च प्रकरणं द्विविधम्। महाप्रकरणमवान्तरप्रकरणं चेति। मुख्यभावनासंबन्धिप्रकरणं महाप्रकरणम्। तेन च प्रयाजादीनां दर्शपूर्णमासाङ्गत्वम्। एतच्च प्रकृतावेव, उभयाकाङ्क्षायाः संभवान्न तु विकृतौ। तत्र प्रकृतिवद्विकृतिः कर्त्तव्येत्यतिदेशेन कथंभावाकाङ्क्षाया उपशमेनापूर्वाङ्गानामप्युभयाकाङ्क्षया विनियोगासम्भवात्। तस्मादपूर्वाङ्गानां स्थानादेव विकृत्यर्थत्वमिति। अङ्गभावनासंबन्धिप्रकरणमवान्तरप्रकरणम्। तेन चाभिक्रमणादीनां प्रयाजाद्यङ्गत्वम्। तच्च सन्दंशेनैव ज्ञायते। तदभावे चाविशेषात्सर्वेषां फलभावनाकथंभावेन ग्रहणप्रसङ्गेन प्रधानाङ्गत्वापत्तेः। एकाङ्गानुवादेन विधीयमानयोरप्यङ्गयोरन्तराले विहितत्वं सन्दंशः। यथाऽभिक्रमणे। तत्र हि “समानयत उपभृतस्तेजो वा”इत्यादिना प्रयाजानुवादेन किंचिदङ्गं विधाय तदनन्तरमपि प्रयाजानुवादेन(१) “यस्यैवं(२) विदुषः प्रयाजा इज्यन्ते प्रैभ्यो लोकेभ्यो भ्रातृव्यान्नुदतेऽभिक्रामं जुहोत्यभिजित्यै” इत्यनन्तरं “यो वै प्रयाजानां मिथुनं वेदे”त्यादि किं चिदङ्गं विधीयते॥

(१) यस्यैवंविदुष इत्यारभ्य तरमित्यन्तो ग्रन्थो ग पुस्तके नोपलभ्यते।

(२) प्रयाजानुवादेन प्रयाजत्वं यस्यैवमिति पाठो ग पुस्तके।

अतः प्रयाजाङ्गमध्येऽभिहितमभिक्रमणं तदङ्गम्। प्रयाजैरपूर्वं कृत्वा यागोपकारं भावयेदिति ज्ञाते कथमेभिरपूर्वं कर्त्तव्यमिति कथंभावाकाङ्क्षायाः सत्त्वात्। सा च संदंशपठितैरभिक्रमणादिभिः शाम्यति। न चाङ्गभावनायां कथंभावाकाङ्क्षाभावः। भावनासाम्येन तत्रापि तत्संभवात्। तदिदं (१) प्रकरणं क्रियाया एव साक्षाद्विनियोजकं द्रव्यगुणयोस्तु तद्द्वारा। तथा हि। यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्यत्र फलभावनायां कथंभावाकाङ्क्षायां सन्निधिपठिताश्रूयमाणफलकं क्रियाजातमुपकार्याकाङ्क्षयेतिकर्त्तव्यतात्वेनान्वेति। क्रियाया एव लोके कथंभावाकाङ्क्षायामन्वयदर्शनात्। न हि हस्तेन(२) कुठारेण छिन्द्यादित्यत्र कथंभावाकाङ्क्षायामुच्चार्य्यमाणोऽपि हस्तोऽन्वेति किं तु हस्तेनोद्यम्य निपात्येति उद्यमननिपातने एव। हस्तस्य तद्द्वारैवान्वेतीति सार्वजनीनमेतत्। इदं च स्थानादिभ्यो बलवत्। अत एवाक्षैर्दीव्यति राजन्यमिति देवनादयो (३) धर्मा अभिषेचनीयसन्निधौ पठिता अपि स्थानान्न तदङ्गं किं तु प्रकरणाद्राजसूयाङ्गमिति॥

देशसामान्यं स्थानम्। तद्द्विविधम्। पाठसादेश्यमनुष्ठानसादेश्यं चेति। स्थानं क्रमश्चेत्यनर्थान्तरम्। पाठसादेश्यमपि द्विविधम्। यथासंख्यपाठः सन्निधिपाठश्चेति। तत्रैन्द्राग्नमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेद् वैश्वानरं द्वादशकपालं निर्वपेदित्येवंक्रमविहितेषु इन्द्राग्नी रोचना दिव इत्यादीनां याज्यानुवाक्यामन्त्रा-

(१) यदिदमिति पाठो “ग च” पुस्तकयोः।

(२) हस्तकुठारेणेति पाठः क पुस्तके। न हि कुठारेणेति घ च पुस्तकयोः।

(३) विदेवनादय इति पाठः ख ग च पुस्तकेषु टीकायां च।

णां यथासंख्यं प्रथमस्य प्रथमं द्वितीयस्य द्वितीयमित्येवंरूपो विनियोगो यथासंख्यपाठात्। प्रथमपठितमन्त्रस्य हि कैमर्थ्याकाङ्क्षायां प्रथमतो विहितं कर्मैव प्रथममुपतिष्ठते समानदेशत्वात्। एवं द्वितीयमन्त्रस्यापि। वैकृताङ्गानां प्राकृताङ्गानुवादेन विहितानां संदंशपतितानां विकृत्यर्थत्वं सन्निधिपाठात्। यथा आमनहोमानाम्। तेषां हि कैमर्थ्याकाङ्क्षायां फलं विकृत्यपूर्वमेव भाव्यत्वेन संबध्यते उपस्थितत्वात्। स्वतन्त्रफलकत्वे विकृतिसन्निधिपाठानर्थक्यापत्तेः। पशुधर्माणामग्नीषोमीयार्थत्वमनुष्ठानसादेश्यात्। औपवसथ्ये ऽह्नि अग्नीषोमीयः पशुरनुष्ठीयते तस्मिन्नेव दिने ते धर्माः पठ्यन्ते। अतस्तेषां कैमर्थ्याकाङ्क्षायामनुष्ठेयत्वेनोपस्थितं पशुपूर्वमेव भाव्यत्वेन संबध्यते। तच्च स्थानं समाख्यातः प्रबलम्। अत एव शुन्धनमन्त्रः सान्नाय्यपात्राङ्गं पाठसादेश्यात्। न तु पौरोडाशिकमिति समाख्यया पुरोडाशपात्राङ्गम्॥

समाख्या यौगिकः शब्दः। सा च द्विविधा वैदिकी लौकिकी च। तत्र होतृचमसभक्षणाङ्गत्वं होतृचमस इति वैदिकसमाख्यया। अध्वर्योस्तत्तत्पदार्थाङ्गत्वं लौकिक्या आध्वर्यवमिति समाख्ययेति सङ्क्षेपः॥

तदेवं निरूपितानि सङ्क्षेपतः श्रुत्यादीनि षट् प्रमाणानि एतत्सहकृतेन विनियोगविधिना समिदादिभिरुपकृत्य दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेतेत्येवंरूपेण यानि नियोज्यन्ते तान्यङ्गानि द्विविधानि सिद्धरूपाणि (१) क्रियारूपाणि चेति। तत्र सिद्धानि

(१) सिद्धानि इति पाठः "ख ग घ च" पुस्तकेषु।

जातिद्रव्यसंख्यादीनि तानि च दृष्टार्थान्येव। क्रियारूपाणि च द्विविधानि गुणकर्माणि प्रधानकर्माणि च एतान्येव सन्निपत्योपकारकाणि आरादुपकारकाणि चोच्यन्ते। कर्माङ्गद्रव्याद्युद्देशेन विधीयमानं कर्म सन्निपत्योपकारकम्। यथा ऽवघातप्रोक्षणादि तच्च दृष्टार्थमदृष्टार्थं दृष्टादृष्टार्थं चेति। तत्र दृष्टार्थमवघातादि। अदृष्टार्थं प्रोक्षणादि। दृष्टादृष्टार्थं पशुपुरोडाशादि। तद्धि द्रव्यत्यागांशेनैव अदृष्टं देवतोद्देशेन च देवतास्मरणं दृष्टं करोति। द्रव्याद्यनुद्दिश्य केवलं विधीयमानं कर्म आरादुपकारकम्। यथा प्रयाजादि। आरादुपकारकं च (१) परमापूर्वोत्पत्तावेवोपयुज्यते। सन्निपत्योपकारकं तु द्रव्यदेवतासंस्कारद्वारा यागस्वरूपे ऽप्युपयुज्यते। इदमेव चाश्रयिकर्मेत्युच्यते। तदेवं निरूपितः सङ्क्षेपतो विनियोगविधिः॥

प्रयोगप्राशुभावबोधको विधिः प्रयोगविधिः। स चाङ्गवाक्यैकवाक्यतापन्नः प्रधानविधिरेव। स हि साङ्गं प्रधानमनुष्ठापयन्विलम्बे प्रमाणाभावादविलम्बापरपर्यायं प्रयोगप्राशुभावं विधत्ते। न च तदविलम्बे ऽपि प्रमाणाभाव इति वाच्यम्। विलम्बे त्वङ्गप्रधानविध्येकवाक्यतावगततत्साहित्यानुपपत्तिः। विलम्बेन क्रियमाणयोः पदार्थयोरिदमनेन सह कृतमिति साहित्यव्यवहाराभावात्। स चाविलम्बो नियते क्रमे आश्रीयमाणे भवति। अन्यथा हि किमेतदनन्तरमेतत्कर्तव्यमेतदनन्तरं वेति प्रयोगविक्षेपापत्तेः। अतः प्रयोगविधिरेव स्वविधेयप्रयोगप्राशुभावसिद्ध्यर्थं नियतं क्रममपि पदार्थविशेषणतया विधत्ते। अत ए-

(१) कर्म आरादुपकारकम्। तच्चेति पाठो 'ग' पुस्तके।

वाङ्गानां क्रमबोधको विधिः प्रयोगविधिरित्यपि लक्षणम्। तत्र क्रमो नाम विततिविशेषः। पौर्वापर्यरूपो वा। तत्र षट् प्रमाणानि श्रुत्यर्थपाठस्थानमुख्यप्रवृत्त्याख्यानि। तत्र क्रमपरं वचनं श्रुतिः। तच्च द्विविधम्। केवलक्रमपरं तद्विशिष्टपदार्थपरं चेति। तत्र वेदं कृत्वा वेदिं करोतीति केवलक्रमपरं वेदिकरणादेर्वचनान्तरप्राप्तत्वात्। वषट्कर्त्तुः प्रथमभक्ष इति तु क्रमविशिष्टपदार्थपरम्। एकप्रसरताभङ्गभयेन भक्षानुवादेन क्रममात्रस्य विधातुमशक्यत्वात्। सेयं श्रुतिरितरप्रमाणापेक्षया बलवती तेषां वचनकल्पनद्वारा क्रमप्रमाणत्वात्। अत एवाश्विनग्रहणस्य पाठक्रमात्तृतीयस्थाने ग्रहणप्रसक्तावाश्विनो दशमो गृह्यतइति वचनाद्दशमस्थाने ग्रहणमित्युक्तम्। यत्र प्रयोजनवशेन क्रमनिर्णयः सोऽर्थक्रमः। यथाऽग्निहोत्रं जुहोति यवागूं पचतीत्यग्निहोत्रयवागूपाकयोः। अत्र हि यवाग्वा होमार्थत्वेन तत्पाकः प्रयोजनवशेन पूर्वमनुष्ठीयते। स चायं पाठक्रमाद्बलवान्। यथापाठं ह्यनुष्ठाने क्रमप्रयोजनबाधे ऽदृष्टार्थत्वं (१) स्यात्। न हि होमानन्तरं क्रियमाणस्य पाकस्य किंचिद्दृष्टं प्रयोजनमस्ति। पदार्थबोधकवाक्यानां यः क्रमः स पाठक्रमः। तस्माच्च पदार्थानां क्रम आश्रीयते। येन हि क्रमेण वाक्यानि पठितानि तेनैव क्रमेणाधीतान्यर्थप्रत्ययं जनयन्ति। यथाप्रत्ययं (२) च पदार्थानामनुष्ठानम्। स च पाठो द्विविधः। मन्त्रपाठो ब्राह्मणपाठश्चेति। तत्राग्नेयाग्नीषोमीययोस्तत्तद्वा-

(१) बाधो ऽदृष्टार्थत्वं चेति 'ख ग च' पुस्तकयोः।
(२) यथार्थप्रत्ययमिति पाठो 'ग च' पुस्तकयोः।

क्यानां याज्यानुवाक्यानां (१) पाठाद्यः क्रम आश्रीयते स मन्त्रपाठात् स चायं मन्त्रपाठो ब्राह्मणपाठाद्बलीयान्। अनुष्ठाने ब्राह्मणवाक्यापेक्षया मन्त्रपाठस्यान्तरङ्गत्वात्। ब्राह्मणवाक्यं हि प्रयोगाद्बहिरेवेदं कर्त्तव्यमित्यवबोध्य कृतार्थम्। मन्त्राः पुनः प्रयोगकाले व्याप्रियन्ते। अनुष्ठानक्रमस्य स्मरणक्रमाधीनत्वात् तत्क्रमस्य च मन्त्रक्रमाधीनत्वादन्तरङ्गो मन्त्रपाठ इति प्रयाजानां समिधो यजति तनूनपातं यजति इत्येवं विधिपाठक्रमाद्यः (२) क्रमः स ब्राह्मणपाठक्रमात्। यद्यपि ब्राह्मणवाक्यान्यर्थं विधाय कृतार्थानि तथापि प्रयाजादीनां क्रमस्मारकान्तरस्याभावात्तान्येव क्रमस्मारकत्वेन स्वीक्रियन्ते॥

स्थानं नामोपस्थितिः। यस्य हि देशे योऽनुष्ठीयते तत्पूर्वतने पदार्थे कृते स एव प्रथममुपस्थितो भवतीति युक्तं तस्य प्रथममनुष्ठानम्। अत एव साद्यस्क्रे अग्नीषोमीयसवनीयानुबन्ध्यानां सवनीयदेशे सहानुष्ठाने कर्त्तव्ये आदौ सवनीयपशोरनुष्ठानमितरयोः पश्चात् तस्मिन्देशे आश्विनग्रहणानन्तरं सवनीयस्यैव प्रथममुपस्थितेः। तथा हि। ज्योतिष्टोमे त्रयः पशुयागा अग्नीषोमीयः सवनीय आनुबन्ध्यश्चेति। ते च भिन्नदेशाः। अग्नीषोमीय औपवसथ्ये ऽह्नि सवनीयः सुत्याकाले आनुबन्ध्यस्त्वन्ते। साद्यस्क्रो नाम सोमयागविशेषः। स चाव्यक्तत्वाज्ज्योतिष्टोमविकारः। अतस्ते त्रयो ऽपि पशुयागाः साद्यस्क्रे चोदकप्रा-

(१) एतत्तद्याज्यानुवाक्याक्रमाद्यः क्रम आश्रीयतइति पाठः 'ख ग' पुस्तकयोः। एतत्तद्याज्यानुक्याक्रम आश्रीयते इति 'च' पुस्तके॥

(२) इत्येवंविधवाक्यक्रमाद्यः इति 'खग' पुस्तकयोः। इत्येवंविधिवाक्यक्रमाद्य इति 'च' पुस्तके।

शः। तेषां तत्र साहित्यं श्रुतं सह पशूनालभत इति। तच्च साहित्यं सवनीयदेशे तस्य प्रधानप्रत्यासत्तेः स्थानातिक्रमणसाम्याच्च। सवनीयदेशे ह्यनुष्ठानेऽग्नीषोमीयानुबन्ध्ययोः स्वस्वस्थानातिक्रमो भवति। अग्नीषोमीयदेशेऽनुबन्ध्यदेशे वानुष्ठाने त्रयाणामपि मध्ये द्वयोः स्वस्वस्थानातिक्रमः(१)। तथा च प्रकृतावाश्विनग्रहं कृत्वा त्रिवृता यूपं परिवीय सवनीयं पशुमुपाकरोतीत्याश्विनग्रहणानन्तरं सवनीयो विहित इति साद्यस्क्रेऽप्याश्विनग्रहणे कृते सवनीय एवोपस्थितो भवत्यतो युक्तं तस्य स्थानात्प्रथममनुष्ठानमितरयोस्तु पश्चादित्युक्तम्॥

प्रधानक्रमेण योऽङ्गानां क्रमः स मुख्यः क्रमः। येन हि क्रमेण प्रधानानि क्रियन्ते तेनैव क्रमेण तेषामङ्गान्यनुष्ठीयन्ते। तदा सर्वेषामङ्गानां स्वैः स्वैः प्रधानैस्तुल्यं व्यवधानं भवति। व्युत्क्रमेणानुष्ठाने केषांचिदङ्गानां स्वैः प्रधानैरत्यन्तमव्यवधानं केषांचिदत्यन्तव्यवधानं स्यात्तच्चायुक्तं प्रयोगविध्यवगतसाहित्यबाधापत्तेः। अतः प्रधानक्रमोऽपि अङ्गक्रमे हेतुः। अत एव प्रयाजशेषेणादावाग्नेयहविषोऽभिघारणं पश्चादैन्द्रस्य दध्नः आग्नेयैन्द्रयागयोः पौर्वापर्यात्। एवं च द्वयोर्द्वयोरभिघारणयोः स्वस्वप्रधानेन तुल्यमेकान्तरितं व्यवधानम्। व्युत्क्रमेणाभिघारणे त्वाग्नेयहविरभिघारणाग्नेययागयोरत्यन्तमव्यवधानम्। ऐन्द्रदध्यभिघारणैन्द्रयागयोर्द्व्यन्तरितं व्यवधानं तच्चायुक्तमित्युक्तमेव। स मुख्यः क्रमः पाठक्रमाद्दुर्बलः। मुख्यक्रमो हि प्रमाणान्तरसापेक्षप्रधानक्रमप्रतिपत्तिसापेक्षतया विलम्बितप्रतिपत्तिकः। पाठक्रमस्तु निरपेक्षस्वाध्यायपाठक्रममात्रसापेक्षतया न तथेति बलवान्। स चायं मुख्यक्रमः प्रवृत्तिक्रमाच्च बलवान्। प्रवृत्तिक्रमे हि द्वितीयादिपदार्थानां प्रथमानुष्ठितक्रमापेक्षा बहूनामङ्गानां (१) प्रधानविप्रकर्षान्मुख्यक्रमे तु सन्निकर्षात्॥

(१) मपि स्वस्वेति पाठः 'च' पुस्तके।

सह प्रयुज्यमानेषु प्रधानेषु सन्निपातिनामङ्गानामावृत्त्याऽनुष्ठाने कर्त्तव्ये द्वितीयादिपदार्थानां प्रथमानुष्ठितपदार्थक्रमाद्यः क्रमः स प्रवृत्तिक्रमः। यथा प्राजापत्यपश्वङ्गेषु प्राजापत्या हि वैश्वदेवीं कृत्वा प्राजापत्यैश्चरन्तीति वाक्येन तृतीयानिर्देशात्सेतिकर्त्तव्यताका एककालत्वेन विहिता अतस्तेषां तदङ्गानां चोपाकरणनियोजनप्रभृतीनां साहित्यं संपाद्यम्। तच्च प्राजापत्यपशूनां संप्रतिपन्नदेवताकत्वेन (२) युगपदनुष्ठानादुपपद्यते। तदङ्गानां चोपाकरणादीनां युगपदनुष्ठानमशक्यम्। अतस्तेषां साहित्यमव्यवहितानुष्ठानात्संपाद्यम्। तच्चैकस्योपाकरणं विधायापरस्योपाकरणं विधेयम्। एवं नियोजनादिकमपि। तथा च प्राजापत्येषु कस्माच्चित्पशोरारभ्य एकं सर्वं सर्वत्रानुष्ठाय (३) द्वितीयादिपदार्थस्तेनैव क्रमेणानुष्ठेयः स प्रवृत्तिक्रमः। सोऽयं श्रुत्यादिभ्यो दुर्बलः। तदेवं संक्षेपतो निरूपितः षड्विधक्रमनिरूपणेन प्रयोगविधिः॥

कर्मजन्यफलस्वाम्यबोधको विधिरधिकारविधिः। कर्मज-

(१) बलवान्। प्रवृत्तिक्रमाच्च बलवान्। प्रवृत्तिक्रमे हि बहूनामङ्गानामिति पाठो 'ग च' पुस्तकयोः॥

(२) देवताकत्वेनेति पाठः केषुचित्पुस्तकेष्वासीदिति टीकालेखतोऽवगम्यते।

(३) एकं सर्वत्रानुष्ठायेति पाठः 'ख ग च' पुस्तकेषु।

न्यफलस्वाम्यं कर्मजन्यफलभोक्तृत्वम्। स च यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्यादिरूपः। स्वर्गमुद्दिश्य यागं विदधता ऽनेन स्वर्गकामस्य यागजन्यफलभोक्तृत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते। यस्याहिताग्नेरग्निर्गृहान् दहेत्सो ऽग्नये क्षामवते ऽष्टाकपालं निर्वपेदित्यादिनाग्निदाहादौ निमित्ते कर्म विदधता निमित्तवतः कर्मजन्यपापक्षयरूपफलस्वाम्यं प्रतिपाद्यते। एवमहरहः सन्ध्यामुपासीतेत्यादिना शुचिविहितकालजीविनः सन्ध्योपासनजन्यप्रत्यवायपरिहाररूपफलस्वाम्यं चोद्यते। तच्च फलस्वाम्यं तस्यैव यो ऽधिकारविशिष्टः। अधिकारश्च (१) यद्विधिवाक्येषु पुरुषविशेषणत्वेन श्रूयते। यथा काम्ये कर्मणि फलकामना नैमित्ते कर्मणि निमित्तनिश्चयः। नित्ये सन्ध्योपासनादौ शुचिविहितकालजीवित्वम्। अत एव राजा राजसूयेन स्वाराज्यकामो यजेतेत्यनेन विधिवाक्येन स्वाराज्यमुद्दिश्य विदधतापि न स्वाराज्यमात्रकामस्य तत्फलभोक्तृत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते। किं तु राज्ञः सतः स्वाराज्यकामस्यैव राजत्वस्यापि अधिकारिविशेषणत्वेन श्रवणात्। क्वचित्तु पुरुषविशेषणत्वेनाश्रुतमप्यधिकारिविशेषणम्। यथाध्ययनविधिसिद्धा विद्या क्रतुविधीनामर्थज्ञानापेक्षणीयत्वेनाध्ययनविधिसिद्धार्थज्ञानवत्त्वं प्रत्येव प्रवृत्तेः। एवमग्निसाध्यकर्मसु आधानसिद्धाग्निमत्ता। अग्निसाध्यकर्मणामग्न्यपेक्षत्वेन तद्विधीनामाधानसिद्धाग्निमत्त्वं प्रत्येव प्रवृत्तेः। एवं सामर्थ्यमपि। आख्यातानामर्थं ब्रुवतां शक्तिः सहकारिणीति न्यायात् समर्थं प्रत्येव विधिप्रवृत्तेः। तदेवं निरूपितो विधिः॥

(१) अधिकारश्च स एवेति 'ख ग च' पुस्तकेषु।

प्रयोगसमवेतार्थस्मारका मन्त्राः। तेषां च तादृशार्थस्मारकत्वेनैवार्थवत्त्वम्। न तु तदुच्चारणमदृष्टार्थम्। संभवति दृष्टफलकत्वे ऽदृष्टफलकल्पनाया अन्याय्यत्वात्। न च दृष्टस्यार्थस्मरणस्य प्रकारान्तरेणापि संभवान्मन्त्राम्नानं व्यर्थमिति वाच्यम्। मन्त्रैरेव स्मर्त्तव्यमिति नियमविध्याश्रयणात्। नानासाधनसाध्यक्रियायामेकसाधनप्राप्तावप्राप्तस्यापरसाधनस्य प्रापको विधिर्नियमविधिः। (१) यथाहुः। विधिरत्यन्तमप्राप्तौ नियमः पाक्षिके सति। तत्र चान्यत्र च प्राप्तौ परिसंख्येति गीयतइति। अस्यार्थः। प्रमाणान्तरेणाप्राप्तस्य प्रापको विधिरपूर्वविधिः। यथा यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्यादिः। स्वर्गार्थकयागस्य प्रमाणान्तरेणाप्राप्तस्यानेन विधानात्। पक्षे ऽप्राप्तस्य प्रापको विधिर्नियमविधिः। यथा व्रीहीनवहन्तीत्यादिः। कथमस्य पक्षे ऽप्राप्तप्रापकत्वमिति चेदित्थम्। अनेन ह्यवघातस्य वैतुष्यार्थत्वं न प्रतिपाद्यते ऽन्वयव्यतिरेकसिद्धत्वात्। किं तु नियमः। स चाप्राप्तांशपूरणम्। वैतुष्यस्य हि नानोपायसाध्यत्वाद्यदा ऽवघातं परित्यज्य उपायान्तरं गृहीतुमारभते तदा ऽवघातस्याप्राप्तत्वन तद्विधाननामकमप्राप्तांशपूरणमेवानेन विधिना क्रियते। अतश्च नियमविधावप्राप्तांशपूरणात्मको नियम एव वाक्यार्थः। पक्षे ऽप्राप्तावघातस्य विधानमिति यावत्। उभयोश्च युगपत्प्राप्तावितरव्यावृत्तिपरो विधिः परिसंख्याविधिः। यथा पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्या इति। इदं हि वाक्यं न पञ्चनखभक्षणपरं तस्य रागतः प्राप्त-

(१) साधनद्वयस्य पक्षे प्राप्तावन्यतरसाधनस्याप्राप्ततादशायां यो विधिः स नियमविधिरिति पाठः 'च' पुस्तके।

त्वात्। नापि नियमपरं पञ्चनखापञ्चनखभक्षणस्य युगपत्प्राप्तेः पक्षे प्राप्त्यभावात्। अत इदमपञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्तिपरमिति भवति परिसंख्याविधिः। सा च द्विविधा। श्रौती लाक्षणिकी चेति। तत्रात्र ह्येवावयन्तीति श्रौती परिसंख्या। एवकारेण पवमानातिरिक्तस्तोत्रव्यावृत्तेरभिधानात्। पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्या इति तु लाक्षणिकी। इतरनिवृत्तिवाचकपदाभावात्। अत एवैषा त्रिदोषग्रस्ता। दोषत्रयं च श्रुतहानिरश्रुतकल्पना प्राप्तबाधश्चेति। तदुक्तम्। श्रुतार्थस्य परित्यागादश्रुतार्थप्रकल्पनात्। प्राप्तस्य बाधादित्येवं परिसंख्या त्रिदूषणा इति श्रुतस्य पञ्चनखभक्षणस्य हानाद् अश्रुतापञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्तेः कल्पनात्प्राप्तस्य चाऽपञ्चनखभक्षणस्य बाधनादिति। अस्मिंश्च दोषत्रये दोषद्वयं शब्दनिष्ठम्। प्राप्तबाधस्त्वर्थनिष्ठ इति दिक्। येषां तु प्रयोगसमवेतार्थस्मारकत्वं न संभवति तदुच्चारणस्यानन्यगत्याऽदृष्टार्थकत्वं कल्प्यते इति नानर्थक्यमिति॥

नामधेयानां च विधेयार्थपरिच्छेदकतया ऽर्थवत्त्वम्। तथा हि। उद्भिदा यजेत पशुकाम इत्यत्रोद्भिच्छब्दो यागनामधेयं तेन च विधेयार्थपरिच्छेदः (१) क्रियते। तथा हि। अनेन वाक्येनाप्राप्तत्वात् फलोद्देशेन यागो विधीयते। यागसामान्यस्याविधेयत्वाद् यागविशेष एव विधीयते। तत्र को ऽसौ यागविशेष इत्यपेक्षायामुद्भिच्छब्दादुद्भिद्रूपो याग इति विज्ञायते उद्भिदा यागेन पशुं भावयेदित्यत्र सामानाधिकरण्येन नामधेयान्वयात्। नामधेयत्वं च निमित्तचतुष्टयात्। मत्वर्थलक्षणाभयाद्वाक्य-

(१) अभिधेयार्थपरिच्छेद इति 'घ' पुस्तके।

भेदभयात्तत्प्रख्यशास्त्रात्तद्व्यपदेशादिति॥

तत्रोद्भिदा यजेत पशुकाम इत्यत्रोद्भिच्छब्दस्य यागनामधेयत्वं मत्वर्थलक्षणाभयात्। तथा हि। न तावदनेन वाक्येन फलं प्रति यागविधानं तं प्रति च गुणविधानं युज्यते। वाक्यभेदापत्तेः। उद्भिच्छब्दस्य गुणसमर्पकत्वे च यागस्याप्यप्राप्तत्वाद्गुणविशिष्टकर्मविधानं वाच्यम्। उद्भिद्वता यागेन पशुं भावयेदिति। विशिष्टविधौ मत्वर्थलक्षणेत्युक्तमेव॥

चित्रया यजेत पशुकाम इत्यत्र चित्राशब्दस्य कर्मनामधेयत्वं वाक्यभेदभयात्। तथा हि। न तावदत्र गुणविशिष्टयागविधानं संभवति। दधि मधु पयो घृतं धाना उदकं तण्डुलाः तत्संसृष्टं प्राजापत्यमित्यनेन गुणस्य विहितत्वात्तद्विशिष्टयागविध्यनुपपत्तेः। यागस्य फलसंबन्धे गुणसम्बन्धे च विधीयमाने वाक्यभेदः। तस्माच्चित्राशब्दः कर्मनामधेयम्। तथा च चित्रायागेन पशुं भावयेदिति सामानाधिकरण्येनान्वयान्न वाक्यभेदः। प्रकृतेष्टेरनेकद्रव्यत्वेन चित्राशब्दवाच्यत्वोपपत्तिः। अग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीत्यत्राग्निहोत्रशब्दस्य कर्मनामधेयत्वं तत्प्रख्यशास्त्रात्। तस्य गुणस्य प्रख्यापकस्य प्रापकस्य (१) शास्त्रस्य विद्यमानत्वादग्निहोत्रशब्दः कर्मनामधेयमिति यावत्। नन्वयं गुणविधिरेव कुतो नेति चेन्न। यद्यग्नौ होत्रमस्मिन्निति सप्तमीसमासमाश्रित्य होमाधारत्वेनाग्निरूपो गुणो विधेयस्तदा यदाहवनीये जुहोतीत्यनेनैवाग्नेः प्राप्तत्वात्तद्विधानानर्थक्यम्। अग्नये होत्रमिति चतुर्थीसमासमाश्रित्य अग्निदेवतारूपगुणो ऽनेन विधीयतइति

(१) तस्य प्रख्यापकस्येति पाठः 'ख ग' पुस्तकयोः।

चेन्न। तद्देवतायाः शाखान्तरेण प्राप्तत्वात्। किं तच्छाखान्तरमिति चेत्। यदग्नये च प्रजापतये च सायं जुहोतीति के चित्। अपरे त्वग्निर्ज्योतिर्ज्योतिरग्निस्स्वाहेति मन्त्रवर्ण एवाग्निरूपदेवताप्रापकः। नन्वग्नेर्मान्त्रवर्णिकत्वे प्रजापतिदेवताया बाधः स्यात्। मन्त्रवर्णस्य चतुर्थीतो दुर्बलत्वात्। यथाहुः॥

तद्धितेन चतुर्थ्या च मन्त्रवर्णेन वा पुनः।
देवताया विधिस्तत्र दुर्बलं तु परंपरमिति॥

चेन्न। यदग्नये च प्रजापतये च सायं जुहोतीत्यत्र न केवलं प्रजापतिविधानम्। किं तु मन्त्रवर्णप्राप्तमग्निमनूद्य तत्समुच्चितप्रजापतेः। एवं च न बाधः केवलप्रजापतिविधानाभावात्। न चात्र समुच्चितोभयविधानमेव कथं नेति वाच्यम्। समुच्चितोभयविधानापेक्षया ऽन्यतः प्राप्तमग्निमनूद्य तत्समुच्चितप्रजापतिमात्रविधाने लाघवात्। एवं च प्रयाजेषु समिदादिदेवतानां समिधः समिधो अग्न आज्यस्य व्यन्त्वित्यादिमन्त्रवर्णेभ्यः प्राप्तत्वात्। समिधो यजतीत्यादिषु समिदादिशब्दास्तत्प्रख्यशास्त्रात्कर्मनामधेयाः॥

श्येनेनाभिचरन् यजेतेत्यत्र श्येनशब्दस्य कर्मनामधेयत्वं तद्व्यपदेशात्। तेन व्यपदेशादुपमानात्तदन्यथानुपपत्तेरिति यावत्। तथा हि यद्विधेयं तस्य स्तुतिर्भवति। यद्यत्र श्येनो विधेयः स्यात् तदार्थवादैस्तस्यैव स्तुतिः कार्या। यथा वै श्येनो निपत्यादत्त एवमयं द्विषन्तं भ्रातृव्यं निपत्यादत्त इत्यनेनार्थवादेन श्येनः स्तोतुं न शक्यः। श्येनोपमानेनार्थान्तरस्तुतेः क्रियमाणत्वात्। न च श्येनोपमानत्वेन स एव स्तोतुं शक्यते। उपमानोपमेयभा-

वस्य भिन्ननिष्ठत्वात्। यदा तु श्येनसंज्ञको यागो विधीयते तदार्थवादेन श्येनोपमानेन तस्य स्तुतिः कर्तुं शक्यत इति श्येनशब्दः कर्मनामधेयं तद्व्यपदेशादिति। उत्पत्तिशिष्टगुणबलीयस्त्वमपि पञ्चमं नामधेयनिमित्तमिति के चित्। यथा वैश्वदेवेन यजेतेत्यादौ। अत्रोत्पत्तिशिष्टाग्न्यादीनां बलीयस्त्वाद्वैश्वदेवशब्दस्य विश्वेदेवदेवताविधायकत्वं न संभवतीति कर्मनामधेयत्वम्। वस्तुतस्तु तत्प्रख्यशास्त्रादेवास्य कर्मनामधेयत्वम्। प्रकृतयागे विश्वेदेवरूपगुणसंप्रतिपन्नशाखस्यार्थवादरूपस्यैव सत्त्वात्। यद्विश्वेदेवाः समयजन्त तद्वैश्वदेवस्य वैश्वदेवत्वम्॥

पुरुषस्य निवर्तकं वाक्यं निषेधः। निषेधवाक्यानामनर्थहेतुक्रियानिवृत्तिजनकत्वेनैवार्थवत्त्वात्। तथा हि। यथा विधिः प्रवर्तनां प्रतिपादयन् स्वप्रवर्तकत्वनिर्वाहार्थं विधेयस्य यागादेरिष्टसाधनत्वमाक्षिपन् पुरुषं तत्र प्रवर्तयति तथा न कलञ्जं भक्षयेदित्यादिनिषेधो ऽपि निवर्तनां प्रतिपादयन् स्वनिवर्तकत्वनिर्वाहार्थं निषेध्यस्य कलञ्जभक्षणस्य परानिष्टसाधनत्वमाक्षिपन् पुरुषं ततो निवर्तयति। ननु निषेधवाक्यस्य कथं निवर्त्तनाप्रतिपादकत्वमिति चेदुच्यते। न तावदत्र धात्वर्थस्य नञर्थेनान्वयः। अव्यवधाने ऽपि तस्य प्रत्ययार्थभावनोपसर्जनत्वेनोपस्थितेः। न ह्यन्योपसर्ज्जनत्वेनोपस्थितमन्यत्रान्वेति। अन्यथा राजपुरुषमानयेत्यादावपि राज्ञः क्रियान्वयापत्तेः। अतः प्रत्ययार्थस्यैव नञर्थेनान्वयः। तत्रापि नाख्यातत्वांशवाच्यार्थभावनायास्तस्या लिङंशवाच्यप्रवर्तनोपसर्जनत्वेनोपस्थितेः। किं तु लिङंशवाच्यशब्दभावनायास्तस्याः सर्वापेक्षया प्रधानत्वात्। नञस्यैव स्व-

भावो यत्समभिव्याहृतपदार्थविरोधिबोधकत्वम्। यथा घटो नास्तीत्यादौ अस्तीतिशब्दसमभिव्याहृतो नञ् घटसत्त्वविरोधि घटासत्त्वं गमयति तद्दिह लिङ्समभिव्याहृतो नञ् लिङर्थप्रवर्तनाविरोधिनीं निवर्त्तनामेव बोधयति। विधिवाक्यश्रवणे ऽयं मां प्रवर्तयतीति प्रतीतेः (१)। तस्मान्निषेधवाक्यस्थले निवर्तनैव वाक्यार्थः। यदा तु प्रत्ययार्थस्य तत्रान्वये बाधकं तदा धात्वर्थस्यैव तत्रान्वयः। तच्च बाधकं द्विविधम्। तस्य व्रतमित्युपक्रमो विकल्पप्रसक्तिश्च। तत्राद्यं नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यमित्यादौ तस्य व्रतमित्युपक्रम्यैतद्वाक्यपाठात्। तथा चात्र पर्युदासाश्रयणम्। तथा हि। व्रतशब्दस्य कर्त्तव्यार्थे रूढत्वात्तस्य व्रतमित्यत्र स्नातकस्य व्रतानां कर्त्तव्यत्वेनोपक्रमात्। किं तत्कर्तव्यमित्याकाङ्क्षायां नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमित्यादिना कर्त्तव्यार्थ एव प्रतिपादनीयः। अन्यथा पूर्वोत्तरवाक्ययोरेकवाक्यत्वं न स्यात्। तथा च नञर्थेन न प्रत्ययार्थान्वयः। कर्त्तव्यार्थानवबोधात्। विध्यर्थप्रवर्त्तनाविरोधिनिवर्त्तनाया एव तादृशनञा बोधनात्। तस्याश्च कर्त्तव्यार्थत्वाभावात्। तस्मान्नेक्षेतेत्यत्र नञा धात्वर्थविरोध्यनीक्षणसंकल्प एव लक्षणया प्रतिपाद्यते तस्य कर्त्तव्यत्वसंभवात्। आदित्यविषयकानीक्षणसंकल्पेन भावयेदिति वाक्यार्थः। तत्र भाव्याकाङ्क्षायां एतावता ह्येनसा वियुक्तो भवतीति वाक्यशेषा-

(१) प्रतीतेरिति। प्रवर्तनाप्रतीतेरित्यर्थः। यद्वा यजेत स्वर्गकाम इति विधिवाक्यश्रवणे ऽयं मां प्रवर्तयतीति प्रवर्तनाप्रतीतिवन्न कलञ्जं भक्षयेदित्यादिनिषेधवाक्यश्रवणे ऽप्ययं मां निवर्तयतीति निवर्तनाप्रतीतेरित्यध्याहारेण, विधीत्यादिहेतुवाक्यं दृष्टान्तदार्ष्टान्तिकविषया योजनीयमिति टीकाग्रन्थः। एतदनुसारेण क्वचित्पुस्तके पाठभेदो ऽपि ॥

वगतः पापक्षयो भाव्यतया ऽन्वेति। एवं च पूर्वोत्तरयोरेकवाक्यत्वं निर्वहत्येव। न चात्र धात्वर्थविरोधिनः पदार्थान्तरस्यापि संभवात्कथमनीक्षणसंकल्पस्यैव भावनान्वय इति वाच्यम्। तस्य कर्त्तव्यताभावेन प्रकृते भावनान्वयायोग्यत्वात्। द्वितीयं यजतिषु येयजामहं करोति नानुयाजेष्वित्यादौ अत्र विकल्पप्रसक्तौ च पर्युदासाश्रयणात्। तथा हि यद्यत्र वाक्ये नञर्थे प्रत्ययार्थान्वयः स्यात्तदानुयाजेषु येयजामहमिति मन्त्रस्य प्रतिषेधः स्यात्। अनुयाजेषु येयजामहं न कुर्यादिति। स च प्राप्तिपूर्वक एव प्राप्तस्यैव प्रतिषेधात्। प्राप्तिश्च यजतिषु येयजामहं करोतीति शास्त्रादेव वाच्या शास्त्रप्राप्तस्य च प्रतिषेधे विकल्प एव न तु बाधः। प्राप्तिमूलरागस्येव तन्मूलशास्त्रस्य शास्त्रान्तरेण बाधायोगात्। न च पदे जुहोतीति विशेषशास्त्रेणाहवनीये जुहोतीति शास्त्रस्येव नानुयाजेष्वित्यनेन यजतिषु येयजामहं करोतीत्यस्य बाधः स्यादिति वाच्यम्। परस्परनिरपेक्षयोरेव शास्त्रयोर्बाध्यबाधकभावात्। पदशास्त्रस्य हि स्वार्थविधानार्थमाहवनीयशास्त्रानपेक्षणान्निरपेक्षत्वम्। प्रकृते तु निषेधशास्त्रस्य निषेध्यप्रसक्त्यर्थं यजतिषु येयजामहमित्यस्यापेक्षणान्न निरपेक्षत्वम्। तस्माच्छास्त्रविहितस्य शास्त्रान्तरेण प्रतिषेधे विकल्प एव। स च न युक्तः। विकल्पे शास्त्रस्य पाक्षिकाप्रामाण्यसंपातात्। न ह्यनुयाजेषु येयजामहमित्यस्यानुष्ठाने नानुयाजेष्वित्यस्य प्रामाण्यं संभवति। व्रीहियागानुष्ठाने यवशास्त्रस्येव द्विरदृष्टकल्पना च स्यात्। विधिप्रतिषेधयोरपि पुरुषार्थत्वात्। अतो नात्र प्रतिषेधस्याश्रयणं किं तु नञो ऽनुयाजसंबन्धमाश्रित्य

पर्युदासस्यैव। इत्थं चानुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेषु यजतिषु येयजामहमिति मन्त्रं कुर्यादिति वाक्यार्थबोधः। नञो ऽनुयाजव्यतिरिक्ते लाक्षणिकत्वात। एवं च न विकल्पः। अत्र च वाक्ये येयजामहइति न विधीयते यजतिषु येयजामह इत्यनेनैव च प्राप्तत्वात्। किं तु सामान्यशास्त्रप्राप्तयेयजामह इत्यनुवादेन तस्यानुयाजव्यतिरिक्तविषयत्वं विधीयते। यद्यजतिषु येयजामहं करोतीति तदनुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेष्वेवेति। नन्वेवं सामान्यशास्त्रप्राप्तस्य विशेषे संकोचनरूपादुपसंहारात्पर्युदासस्य भेदो न स्यादिति चेन्न। उपसंहारो हि तन्मात्रसंकोचार्थः। यथा पुरोडाशं चतुर्द्धा करोतीति समान्यप्राप्तं चतुर्द्धाकरणम्। आग्नेयं चतुर्द्धा करोतीति विशेषादाग्नेयपुरोडाशमात्रे संकोच्यते। पर्युदासस्तु तदन्यमात्रसंकोचार्थ इति ततो भेदात्। कुत्रचित् विकल्पप्रसक्तावप्यनन्यगत्या प्रतिषेधाश्रयणम्। यथा नातिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णातीत्यादौ। अत्र हि अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णातीति शास्त्रप्राप्तषोडशिग्रहणस्य निषेधाद्विकल्पप्रसक्तावपि न पर्युदासाश्रयणम्। असंभवात्। तथा हि। यद्यत्र षोडशिपदाथन नञर्थान्वयस्तदातिरात्रे षोडशिव्यतिरिक्तं गृह्णातीति वाक्यार्थबोधः स्यात्स च न संभवति। अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णातीति प्रत्यक्षविधिविरोधात्। यदि चातिरात्रेण पदार्थेनान्वयस्तदातिरात्रव्यतिरिक्ते षोडशिनं गृह्णातीति वाक्यार्थबोधः स्यात्सो ऽपि न संभवति तद्विधिविरोधात्। अतो ऽत्रानन्यगत्या शास्त्रप्राप्तषोडशिग्रहणस्यैव निषेधः। न च विकल्पप्रसक्तिः तस्याप्यपेक्षणीयत्वात्। इयांस्तुविशेषो यद्विकल्पादेकप्रति-

षेधे ऽपि प्रतिषिध्यमानस्य नानर्थहेतुत्वम्। विधिनिषेधोभयस्यापि क्रत्वर्थत्वात्। यत्र तु न विकल्पः प्राप्तिश्च रागत एव प्रतिषेधश्च पुरुषार्थः तत्र प्रतिषिध्यमानस्यानर्थहेतुत्वम्। यथा न कलञ्जं भक्षयेदित्यादौ कलञ्जभक्षणादेः। तत्र भक्षणनिषेधस्यैव पुरुषार्थत्वात्। न च दीक्षितो न ददाति न जुहोतीत्यादौ शास्त्रप्राप्तदानहोमादीनां निषेधाद्विकल्पापत्तिरिति वाच्यम्। स्वतः पुरुषार्थभूतदानहोमादीनां निषेधस्य पुरुषार्थत्वाभावे ऽपि (१) निषिध्यमानस्यानर्थहेतुत्वात् यथा क्रतौ स्त्रीगमनादेः। तन्निषेधस्य क्रत्वर्थत्वेन तस्य क्रतुवैगुण्यसंपादकत्वात्॥

प्राशस्त्यनिन्दान्यतरपरं वाक्यमर्थवादः। तस्य च लक्षणया प्रयोजनवदर्थपर्यवसानम्। तथा हि। अर्थवादवाक्यं हि स्वार्थप्रतिपादने प्रयोजनाभावाद्विधेयनिषेध्ययोः प्राशस्त्यनिन्दितत्वे लक्षणया प्रतिपादयति। स्वार्थमात्रपरत्वे आनर्थक्यप्रसङ्गात्। आम्नायस्य हि क्रियार्थत्वात्। न चेष्टापत्तिः। स्वाध्यायो ऽध्येतव्य इत्यध्ययनविधिना सकलवेदाध्ययनं कर्त्तव्यमिति बोधयता सर्ववेदस्य प्रयोजनवदर्थपर्यवसायित्वं सूचयतोपात्तत्वेनानर्थक्यानुपपत्तेः। स द्विविधः। विधिशेषो निषेधशेषश्चेति। तत्र वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकाम इत्यादिविधिशेषस्य वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवतेत्यादेर्विधेयार्थप्राशस्त्यबोधकतयार्थवत्त्वम्। बर्हिषि रजतं न देयमित्यादिनिषेधशेषस्य सो ऽरोदीद्यदरोदीत्तद्रुद्रस्य रुद्रत्वमित्यादेर्निषेधस्य निन्दितत्वबोधकतयार्थवत्त्वम्। न च प्राशस्त्यादिबोधस्य निष्प्रयोजनत्वेन नार्थवाद-

(१) पिक्रत्वर्थत्वेनेति पाठो ग पुस्तके।

स्यार्थवत्त्वमिति वाच्यम् । आलस्यादिवशादप्रवर्त्तमानस्य पुंसः प्रवृत्त्यादिजनकत्वेन तद्बोधस्योपयोगात् । स पुनस्त्रेधा । तदुक्तम् । विरोधे गुणवादः स्यादनुवादोऽवधारिते । भूतार्थवादस्तद्धानादर्थवादस्त्रिधा मत इति । अस्यार्थः । प्रमाणान्तरविरोधे सत्यर्थवादो गुणवादः । यथाऽऽदित्यो यूप इत्यादि । यूपे आदित्याभेदस्य प्रत्यक्षबाधितत्वादादित्यवदुज्ज्वलत्वरूपगुणोऽनेन लक्षणया प्रतिपाद्यते । प्रमाणान्तरावगतार्थबोधकोऽनुवादः । यथाऽग्निर्हिमस्य भेषजमित्यत्र हिमविरोधित्वस्याग्नौ प्रत्यक्षावगतत्वात् । प्रमाणान्तरविरोधतत्प्राप्ति(१)-रहितार्थबोधको वादो भूतार्थवादः । यथेन्द्रो वृत्राय वज्रमुदयच्छदित्यादि । एवं च यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्यादि निखिलवेदस्य साक्षात्परंपरया वा यागादिधर्मप्रतिपादकत्वं सिद्धम् । सोऽयं धर्मो यदुद्दिश्य विहितस्तदुद्देशेन क्रियमाणस्तद्धेतुः । ईश्वरार्पणबुद्ध्या क्रियमाणस्तु निश्रेयसहेतुः । न च तदर्पणबुद्ध्यानुष्ठाने प्रमाणाभावः । यत्करोषि यदश्नासि यज्जुहोषि ददासि यत् । यत्तपस्यसि कौन्तेय तत्कुरुष्व मदर्पणमिति भगवद्गीतास्मृतेरेव प्रमाणत्वात् । स्मृतिचरणे तत्प्रामाण्यस्य श्रुतिमूलकत्वेन व्यवस्थापनादिति शिवम् ॥

बालानां सुखबोधाय भास्करेण सुमेधसा ।
रचितोऽयं समासेन जैमिनीयार्थसंग्रहः ॥

इति श्रीमहोपाध्यायलौगाक्षिभास्करविरचितपूर्वमीमांसार्थसंग्रहनामकं प्रकरणं समाप्तिमगात् ॥

(१) प्रमाणान्तराविरोधतः स्तुति इति पाठो ग च पुस्तकयोः ।

TRANSLATION.

Reverence to Krishṇa.—

Having shown his reverence to Vásudeva the husband of Ramá, Laugákshi—Bháskara composes the Artha-Saṃgraha as an introduction to the doctrine of Jaimini.

The highly benevolent reverend Jaimini has composed a book in twelve adhyáyas for the discriminative knowledge of duty. At its beginning he speaks of the desire of knowing duty in the following aphorism "next therefore a desire to know duty". In this aphorism the word "next" expresses the immediate consecution (of the desire of knowing duty) on the reading of the Veda. The word "therefore" expresses the circumstance of the reading of the Veda having a visible purpose (and not merely tending to produce an unseen result as f. i. the performance of the sacrifices does)., as the passage enjoining the reading of the Veda (viz. "one is to read the Veda") settles that this reading has for its visible purpose the knowledge of the sense of the Veda. (For a proper understanding of the aphorism quoted above) we have therefore to complement the aphorism as follows "Because the reading of the Veda has a visible purpose which consists in the knowledge of its sense, for this reason, after the reading of the Veda, the desire of knowing duty which latter is the purport of the Veda has to be entertained. The phrase "desire of knowing" implies the idea of enquiry, so that the aphorism actually refers to the beginning of the (Mímáṃsá—) śástra and means "this Śástra whose matter is the enquiry into duty is to be begun." (1)

Here the question arises :—What is duty? what is its distinctive character (its definition)?—To this we reply: Sacrifices etc. only(2) are duty ; and we define duty as that matter which has a

(1) For a full discussion of the not very important question of the meaning of atha and atas see Jaim. Nyáya M. V. pp. 11. 12.

(2) The word "only" serves to exclude quasi—religious acts like the worship of chaityas which are not taught in the Veda.

purpose and is to be accomplished according to the Veda. The phrase "which has a purpose" serves to exclude from the things comprised in the definition matters which are themselves of the nature of a purpose (as f. i. the different results of the sacrifices viz. paradise etc.).—The phrase "which is to be accomplished according to the Veda" serves to exclude from the definition matters like the act of eating (which is performed not on the authority of the Veda but on the prompting of a natural instinct). The word "matter" (artha; which includes the idea of goodness or usefulness) serves to exclude actions like the sacrifice called "Śyena", which are to be considered as bad things (anartha) on account of their having a bad result (viz. the death of some enemy, for the bringing about of which the sacrificer himself will have to go to hell).(1)

Here it might be objected that this definition of duty is in conflict with the definition given in the Mímáṃsá-Sútras where it is said (I. 2) "Duty is that matter the distinctive character of which is instigation"; in which latter definition the word "instigation" denotes only that one part of the Veda which has the form of injunctions (vidhi).—To this we reply that in reality the two definitions are not conflicting because in the Sútra also the word "instigation" denotes the Veda in general as the whole Veda on account of its aiming at duty serves to express the accomplishment of duty.

(If now we be asked to point out in detail the appropriateness of our definition of duty we proceed:) Acts of duty as sacrifices etc. are enjoined with reference to man by vedic sentences (as f. i. "he who is desirous of paradise is to sacrifice") in which paradise etc. is pointed out as the result. The particulars are as follows. The word "yajeta" "he may sacrifice" contains two constituent elements viz. the root yaj (yaji) and the suffix. The suffix again contains

(1) Cp. Jaim. Nyáy. M. V. pp. 14. 15. But why then—might it be asked—are Sacrifices of the nature of the Śyena taught in the Veda?—To this question the Śabara—bháshya (p. 5) answers: (Katham punar anarthaḥ kartavyatayopadiśyate-uchyate—) naiva śyenádayaḥ kartavyá vijnáyante—yo hi himsitum ichchhet tasyáyam abhyupáyaḥ—iti hi teshám upadeśaḥ—śyenenábhicharan yajeta iti hi samámananti—na abhicharitavyam iti.

two elements as it expresses as well the property of a verb as the property of an optative. The property of expressing a verb is common to the suffixes of the ten moods and tenses (all of which when added to a root turn the latter into a verb); the property of expressing an optative exclusively belongs to the optative suffixes.—Both elements express a creative energy (bhávaná) only.(1) By bhávaná ("creative energy" or "productive energy" or "tendency to realize something") we understand the particular activity of some productive agent (bhávayitṛi) which tends to bring about the existence of something which is going to be (bhavitṛi; which is capable of future existence). Such productive energy is twofold being either verbal (śábda) or actual (ártha)—By "verbal bhávaná" we understand the peculiar activity of some productive agent which tends to make a person act; it is expressed by the optative element (of words like "yajeta"); for if some person hears a verb with an optative termination there arises in his mind the exclusive notion "he (the speaker) instigates me to act; he is engaged in an energy tending to make me act." (In this explanation of the element which expresses the bhávaná we proceed) according to the general rule that whatever is exclusively understood in consequence of some word being uttered is expressed by it (is the sense of the word); as f. i. in the sentence "bring the cow" the general character of cow (gotva) is the sense of the word "cow." The peculiar activity (which has been mentioned above in the definition of bhávaná) is in the case of a sentence belonging to ordinary worldly language some particular intention dwelling in the mind of a speaking person; in vedic sentences on the other hand where there is no speaking person it resides only in the words characterized by optative terminations etc. For this reason this bhávaná is called verbal bhávaná.

This bhávaná requires three constituent elements; the matter which is to be accomplished (the result; sádhya); the means by which the result is effected (the instrument; sádhana); and the mode in which the result is effected (itikartavyatá); according to the three questions (suggested by each bhávaná): what is to be ef-

(1) The word "only" is meant to exclude the agent (kartṛi) etc.

fected? by what means is it to be effected? how is it to be effected?—Here now the want of a result to be accomplished being felt there steps in the actual bhávaná (árthí bhávaná) with its three constituent elements which we shall explain further on and fills the place of the wanted result, since here takes place a samánábhidhána-śruti i. e. a direct statement of the intimate connexion of two matters by means of the two being expressed by the same word, (the śábdí as well as the árthí bhávaná being expressed by the one optative form). (To supply the árthí bhávaná—i. e. the peculiar energy of a person to which the śábdí bhávaná instigates—as that which is to be accomplished is more natural than to supply anything else as f. i. the sacrifice itself, because the optative form of words like "yajeta" expresses both bhávanás, from which circumstance the intimate connexion of the two is readily inferred). It might perhaps be remarked by some one that other matters too, as f. i. number (i. e. singular, dual, plural) and time (present etc.) are expressed by the one optative affix and that therefore number, time etc. likewise occupy the place of sádhya with regard to the verbal bhávaná. But such an assumption would be erroneous as number, time etc. are not fit to fill the place of the thing to be accomplished.—If the want of an instrument (of the verbal bhávaná) arises, the place of such a one is filled by the knowledge of the optative form etc. The instrumentality of the optative does not lie in its producing the bhávaná—for the latter exists in the word even before the knowledge (by some person) of the optative form—; but rather in the circumstance of the optative form expressing the bhávaná or its tending to bring about the result to be effected by the verbal bhávaná (which result as remarked above is the actual bhávaná).—If finally the want of a mode (of the verbal bhávaná) presents itself, the place of such a one is filled by the praise or glorification (of the acts of duty) which is found in the arthaváda-passages.

Actual (árthí) bhávaná is to be defined as the peculiar energy (of some person) which refers to some action (as f. i. a sacrifice) which energy is engendered by the desire of some object. This actual bhávaná is—in words like yajeta—expressed by that element of the

word which denotes the verb; for the verb in general (independent of the different moods and tenses) expresses an energy.—This bhávaná too requires three constituent elements, the matter which is to be accomplished,—the result; the means by which the result is effected—the instrument; and the mode in which the result is effected; according to the three questions (suggested by the actual bhávaná as well as the verbal bhávaná): what is to be effected? by what means is it to be effected? how is it to be effected? If the thing to be accomplished is asked for, results of the nature of paradise step in as the things to be accomplished; if the instrument is asked for, actions like the sacrifice present themselves as the instruments (by which the result is obtained); if the mode of action is asked for, all the subsidiary matters as f. i. the prayájas (which form a part of the sacrifice) present themselves and point out the mode of action.

If now the question is asked "what is the Veda", we answer: sentences not produced by man. The Veda is fivefold, being either injunction (vidhi) or sacrificial formula (mantra) or name (námadheya) or prohibition (nishedha) or explanatory statement (arthaváda). That part of the Veda which intimates a thing not known (by other means) is called "Injunction."

Injunction has a sense in consequence of its enjoining a matter having a certain purpose in as far as it enjoins the matter as not established by any other means of proof (1); as f. i. the vedic passage "he who is desirous of paradise is to offer the agnihotra;" which injunction enjoins an oblation having for its purpose (the attaining of) paradise which is not settled by any other means of proof; so that the sense conveyed by the passage is "he is to realize paradise by means of the Agnihotra-oblation". When on the other hand the (sacrificial) action is already settled by some other means of proof, an injunction merely enjoins somesecondary matter (guṇa) with a view to that action. As is f. i. the case in the passage "he is to perform the oblation by means of sour milk." Here, the oblation itself being already established by the injunction "he is to

(1) This appears a somewhat clumsy way of stating what is more clearly expressed in the following words of the Ápadevi: Sa cha vidhiḥprayojanavadarthavidhánenárthaván sa chápráptam arthaṃ vidhatte.

offer the Agnihotra", there is only enjoined sour milk with a view to the oblation (as the material to be used for the oblation); so that the sense is "he is to realize the oblation by means of sour milk."—Where both things are non-established (i. e. in the case of neither the sacrifice nor any secondary matter pertaining to the sacrifice being established by a previous injunction), the injunction enjoins something particularized (or specialized; viśishṭa); as f. i. in the injunction "he is to sacrifice by means of soma"; here, the soma as well (which is the material of the sacrifice) as the sacrifice itself not being established (by any other injunction), there takes place the injunction of that sacrifice which is particularized by soma (as its material).—Nor is it to be objected that (the passage being interpreted in the aforesaid manner) there takes place a split of the sentence (vákyabheda) the word "somena" enjoining two things; for there are not enjoined two separate things, but only one particularized thing (viz. that particular sacrifice for which soma is used).—Nor again is it to be objected that the passage "somena yajeta" merely enjoins soma as the material of that sacrifice which itself is already established by the other passage "he who is desirous of paradise is to sacrifice by means of the jyotishṭoma," so that the sense of the injunction would be "he is to realize tbe sacrifice (the jyotishṭoma) by means of soma"; it being pleaded for this interpretation that it allows us to dispense with the assumption of possessive indication (matvartha-lakshaṇá; by which term is understood the denoting a thing by something else connected with it, as a quality etc.; as when the word "soma" is made to denote a sacrifice in which soma is used). For the passage referring to the jyotishṭoma is an injunction intimating a claim (adhikára-vidhi) and this cannot be taken as an originative injunction (utpatti-vidhi; if the passage about the jyotishṭoma could be taken as the one containing the primary, original injunction of the soma-sacrifice, the passage "somena yajeta" might be taken as a guṇa-vidhi and thus "somena" would not have to be explained as meaning "somavatá yágena; but as the purport of the passage about the jyotishṭoma is not simply to enjoin the soma-sacrifice but to intimate the claim which the sacrificer has to the fruit of the sacrifice, we are compelled to take "somena yajeta" as the originative injunction of the soma-sacrifice and therefore to explain "somena" by "somavatá yágena").—To this reasoning it might be objected that the passage about the jyotishṭoma may be taken as comprising an originative injunction as well as an injunction intimating a claim as this is avowedly the case with other passages as f. i. the passage "he who desires cattle is to sacrifice with the udbhid." But we answer: It is not so. In the apparently parallel case which you adduce (viz. the passage about the udbhid) we assume the double nature of the injunction because such an assumption is unavoidable, there being no other statement originative of the sacrifice (while in the case of the soma-sacrifice there are two injunctions; the instances are therefore not parallel).—And moreover if we explain the passage about the jyotishṭoma as containing two injunctions it would have to be taken as intimating the sacrifice itself and its connection with its fruit and this would be a manifest split of the sentence; better than which is the assumption of the passage enjoining something particularized (a sacrifice particularized by soma), by means of our attributing to the word soma the power of possessive indication.—

Injunction is of four different kinds, being either originative injunction (utpattividhi) or applicatory injunction (viniyogavidhi) or injunction of a claim (adhikáravidhi) or injunction of performance (prayogavidhi).

That injunction which merely indicates the general nature of some action is called originative injunction as f. i. the passage "he is to offer the agnihotra-oblation". In injunctions of this kind the sacrificial action itself occupies the place of the instrument, so that the sense of the passage is "he is to realize the object of his desire by means of the agnihotra-oblation."—But, it may be objected, the two forms (aspects; rúpa) of a sacrifice are the material (offered) and the divinity (to whom the material is offered). How then can the passage "he is to offer the agnihotra-oblation", in which neither of these two forms is mentioned be considered an originative injunction, the word "agnihotra" (which seemingly indicates the divinity of the sacrifice viz. agni) being merely a name (and not indicating the divinity) according to the principle of (the existence of another scriptural passage) declaratory of it; (which

principle will be explained in the chapter on námadheya).—To this objection we reply: The passage is an originative injunction although neither of the two forms of the sacrifice is mentioned in it. Otherwise the passage "he is to perform the oblation by means of sour milk" would have to be considered as the originative injunction (of the agnihotra) as it contains a statement of one of the two forms (viz. the material) and then the passage "he is to offer the agnihotra-oblation" would be purposeless.

That injunction which intimates the connexion of some subsidiary matter with some principal matter is called applicatory injunction (showing how the subsidiary matter is to be applied to the principal matter). As f. i. the passage "he is to perform the oblation by means of sour milk" which enjoins the connexion, with the oblation, of sour milk the subsidiary position of which is intimated by the third case-affix (the case-affix of dadhná showing that sour milk is to be used as an instrument and therefore is merely subsidiary to the action whose instrument it is). So that the sense of the passage is "he is to realize the oblation by means of sour milk".—In injunctions of some secondary matter (guṇa) that which is expressed by the root (as "juhoti" in the above example) occupies the position of the object to be accomplished (so that "juhoti" is properly explained by "homam bhávayet.—In an utpatti-vidhi and an adhikáravidhi on the the other hand the root denotes the instrument; agnihotram juhoti = agnihotra-homena ishṭam bhávayet).

Sometimes the root expresses the abode of an action as f. i. "he is to perform the oblation for him, who is desirous of strength of the senses, by means of sour milk"; where the sense is "he is ;to realize strength of the senses by the instrumentality of sour milk"; and if now the question arises "wherein does it (the instrumentality of sour milk) reside?" the oblation which is mentioned close by steps in denoting the abode.

Injunctions of this kind are assisted by six means of proof, viz. direct statement (śruti); power (liṅga); sentence or syntactical connexion (vákya); interdependence (prakaraṇa); place or order (sthána); name (samákhyá). Applicatory injunctions assisted by these six means of proof intimate subsidiary relation; the

subsidiary position of something consists in its being accomplished by the action of some agent engaged in the pursuit of some other result (so f. i. the prayájas are performed by a sacrificer offering the newmoon-sacrifice with a view to obtaining paradise); the same subsidiary position is expressed by the term "párárthya" "existing for the purpose of something else."

(We now proceed to a detailed discussion of the above mentioned six means of proof).

Direct statement (śruti; literally "text") we define as irrespective or independent words (words which intimate their sense directly without any intermediate steps of the nature of those required by the other means of proof). Direct statement is of three different kinds being either injunctive (vidhátrí) or denotative (abhidhátrí) or applicative (viniyoktrí). To the first class belong the direct statements contained in optative forms etc. (the optative form directly indicating the bhávaná). To the second class belong statements as those about the rice-grains (viz. sentences like "vríhín avahanti" "vríhín prokshati" etc., where the word "rice-grains" directly produces the idea of the corresponding thing and its connexion with the bhávaná). If finally from the mere hearing (the mere statement) of a word a connexion (between some primary and some subsidiary matter) is understood, we have an applicatory śruti.

Śruti of this latter kind is again threefold, being either direct statement by means of case-affixes or direct statement by means of one denotative word (or element of a word) or direct statement by means of one pada (in the restricted grammatical sense). Direct statement by means of case-affixes expresses the relation of a subsidiary, as f. i. in the passage "he is to sacrifice by means of rice grains" where by the direct statement of the third case-affix the subsidiary relation of the rice-grains to the sacrifice is expressed. This subsidiary relation is here brought about by the rice-grains forming the original substance out of which the cake is made (which latter stands in direct subsidiary relation to the sacrifice); in the same way as the animal (offered in the animal sacrifice) stands in subsidiary relation to the sacrifice in consequence of its being the original substance from which the parts actually offered

viz. the heart etc. are taken.—In the passage "he is to buy the soma by means of a tawny, one year old (cow)" the quality of being tawny is by the direct enunciation of the third case affix shown to stand in subsidiary relation to the act of buying; this subsidiary relation takes here place by (the quality's) defining a substance viz. the cow, not directly; the latter not being possible on account of the immateriality of a mere quality.—Again in the passage "he sprinkles the rice-grains with water" the sprinkling stands in subsidiary relation to the rice-grains, as appears from the direct enunciation of the second case affix. And, it is to be observed, this sprinkling is not for the sake of the rice-grains considered in themselves as they would be perfect without the sprinkling, but has the purpose of bringing about the transcendental result (apúrva), which would not be brought about were the sacrifice performed without sprinkling the rice grains with water. In the same manner it is to be understood with reference to all subsidiaries that the subsidiary relation has the purpose of contributing towards bringing about the transcendental result.—Let us take another passage. "Thus I seized this bridle of the right; with these words he is to take hold of the bridle of the horse." Here the direct enunciation of the second case affix shows the mantra to stand in a subsidiary relation to the bridle of the horse.(1)—Or another passage. "When he offers the oblation in the áhavaníya-fire." Here the seventh case affix shows that the áhavaníya stands in auxiliary relation to the

(1) The above quoted example seems hardly to fall under the category of śruti but rather under vákya; which opinion as we see from the commentary was actually held by some teachers. The commentary says "some teachers maintain that the application (of the mantra to the action of taking the bridle of the horse) is founded on vákya. Others however object to this assumption and maintain that, in consequence of linga having greater force than vákya, linga would settle the mantra's standing in subsidiary relation to a bridle in general before vákya could establish its exclusive relation to the bridle of the horse. Those however who suppose the application of the mantra to be founded on vákya defend their opinion by maintaining that the mantra does not point to a bridle in general but to the bridle of the right i. e. the horse which is an instrument to bring about the right and that therefore the mantra is to be applied to the taking of the horse's bridle in consequence of the vákya "aśvábhidhánim ádatte" which is merely assisted by linga.—The author of the text (i. e. Laugákshi-Bháskara) however does not admit that a linga in the mantra points to some peculiar kind of bridle (rather than to the bridle in general).

offering.—Thus in other cases too direct statement by means of case-affixes points out the proper application (of subsidiary matters).

(We now proceed to the two other kinds of viniyoktrí śruti). In the sentence "paśuná yajeta" "he is to sacrifice by means of an animal" direct statement by means of one denotative word points out the subsidiary relation in which singularity and masculinity stand to the káraka; while again direct statement by means of one denotative word points out the subsidiary relation in which the number expressed by the verbal termination of "yajeta" stands to the bhávaná. On the other hand direct statement by means of one pada points out that this number stands in subsidiary relation to the sacrificial action (for the sacrificial action as well as the singular number is expressed by the one pada "yajeta.")

Nor is the following objection to be raised "how can the immaterial number stand in subsidiary relation to the bhávaná?"; for this is possible in consequence of the number defining an agent. This agent again is to be supplied by inference. For the verb expresses the bhávaná only; but the bhávaná can not take place without an agent and therefore it leads to the inference of the latter.

Direct enunciation is stronger than suggestive power (linga) and the other proofs (by which one thing is shown to be subsidiary to another); for in cases where the subsidiary relation is established by suggestive power there is no verbal statement to be found which would directly teach the application (of a secondary matter to a primary one), but such a statement has to be formed (viz. from the sentence containing the linga); and in as far as in the latter case an applicatory injunction has to be assumed while in the case of direct enunciation such a one is already actually existing, the power of linga etc. which is founded on an assumption is set aside by the power of the direct enunciation. For this reason we do not conclude at once on the ground of suggestive power that a verse (apparently) addressed to Indra (i. e. a verse containing a mention of Indra's name or one of his attributes etc.) is really to be used for addressing Indra; but rather decide if we find at the same time a direct enunciation as f. i. "with a verse bearing Indra's mark he addresses the Gárhapatya" that in consequence of the direct enun-

ciation of the second case termination (gárhapatyam) the verse is subsidiary to the act of addressing the Gárhapatya-fire.(1)

Power residing in words (the power words possess to denote or point out something) is called liṅga. As it is said "the power of all words is named liṅga". By power the same thing is understood as by the technical term rúḍhi (conventional meaning ; i. e. a word has the power of denoting that thing as whose name it has been settled by convention and tradition) and it can therefore not be said that liṅga does not differ from samákhyá (name); for liṅga which bases altogether on conventional meaning is different from name (samákhyá) which consists in words the meaning of which is to be made out from the meaning of their constituent parts. Therefore the mantra "I cut grass for the seat of the gods" can only be taken as being subsidiary to the cutting of kuśa-grass and not to the cutting of ulapa-grass and other kinds of grass, since from the power residing in the words "I cut etc." it appears that the mantra is able to declare the cutting of kuśa-grass only.(2)

In the same manner in other places too the application of a subsidiary matter is to be learned from suggestive power.

Power (liṅga) has greater force than syntactical connexion (vákya) and the following means of proof. Let us take for an example the following mantra "I make a pleasant seat for thee, I make it very lovely with a stream of ghee ; on this, the immortal one, sit down, repose on it propitiously minded o marrow of the rice-grains". Here the first half of the mantra (I make a pleasant seat—ghee) is to be considered as subsidiary to the act of making

(1) The quoted ṛik is "sometimes thou art not hurtful, Indra, but comest to the worshipper" etc.; a verse which as mentioning Indra would be considered as connected with the worship of Indra, were it not for the direct statement referring it to the adoration of the Gárhapatya. The decision in favour of śruti as possessing greater force than liṅga rests on the principle that on tbe basis of liṅga an injunction may be constructed containing a direct statement (in the above case "aindramantreṇa indram upatishṭheta); that however a direct statement actually found in the text (aindryá gárhapatyam upatishṭhate) has greater force than one constructed.

(2) The example of liṅga given in the text does not come in very appropriately after the remark on the difference of liṅga and samákhyá as samákhyá has nothing whatever to do with it.—The passage is discussed as giving rise to a doubt in the Mím. Sútr.; but the doubt is wether words like barhis are to be taken in their mukhya (primary) sense only or also in their gauṇa (secondary) or derived sense.

a seat for the sacrificial cake, on account of the power of the words "I make a seat", and (the decision to what act the different parts of the mantra are subsidiary) is not to be made according to syntactical connexion (In the above mantra the two halves form one syntactical whole, the connexion being effected by the word "tasmin" (on this) beginning the second half. It might therefore be maintained that the whole undivided mantra is subsidiary to one act, either the making of a seat for the cake or the placing of the cake on the seat ; or else that both acts are to be accompanied by the whole mantra. But here liṅga steps in and shows that one half belongs to the preparation of a seat and the other half to the placing of the cake).

By sentence or syntactical connexion (vákya) we understand common employment and by this term we understand the connected enunciation of two words denoting two things which in reality stand to each other in the relation of principal and subsidiary although this is not indicated by second case affixes etc. directly indicating the one of the two things to be the thing to be accomplished by the other etc. (which relations are directly indicated by vibhakti-śruti etc.) Take f. i. the passage "he whose sacrificial ladle is made of parṇa-wood hears no evil sound." Here we see from the connected enunciation of the quality of consisting of parṇa-wood and the ladle that the former stands in subsidiary relation to the latter. Nor is it to be said that the circumstance of being made of parṇa-wood is purposeless as the ladle could be made also in a different way (i. e. from some other kind of wood). For the word ladle intimates at the same time the peculiar transcendental result to be accomplished by it (by a ladle made of parṇa-wood). So that the sense of the passage is "By its being made of parṇa-wood he is to realize the peculiar transcendental result connected with the ladle, by means of carrying in it the oblation after it has been taken out of the vessel (by avadána). As it thus appears that if the ladle is made of parṇa-wood then the transcendental result to be brought about by it ensues and not in any other case the circumstance of its consisting of parṇa-wood is not purposeless.—The phrase "by means of carrying in it the oblation after it has been taken out of the vessel by avadána" (i. e. the

last clause of this phrase) is necessarily to be used as otherwise the quality of being made of parṇa-wood might be extended to sruva, sruk etc. also (for these implements also might be denoted by the word "juhú"—explained as a yaugika "húyate'nayá"—and in them also the oblation is carried, but not when it has been taken out of the vessel in the manner called avadána).

This quality of the ladle of being made of parṇa-wood although it is given in the text in a detached rule (anárabhyádhíta; a rule which stands by itself, out of connexion with some particular sacrifice to which it might be referred; so that it must be considered as a general rule) is to be referred only to all the fundamental forms of the sacrifice (prakṛiti) not to their modifications (vikṛiti); for with regard to the latter it is already settled by an express rule (viz. by the general principle that a modification is to be performed in the same way as the fundamental form of which it is a modification) and thus there would be a useless repetition (if we directly referred the statement about the ladle having to be made of parṇa-wood to the modifications also).

A fundamental form of the sacrifice (prakṛiti) is that one where we find a set of direct rules extending over all the subsidiary things (requisite for the sacrifice). Of this nature is f. i. the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice, in immediate connexion with which we find all the requisite subsidiary matters stated in the text.—A mere modification (vikṛiti) on the other hand is that form of sacrifice where there are no direct rules with regard to the subsidiary matters, as f. i. the oblation made to Súrya (sauryam charum nirvapet); there some of the subsidiaries are settled (not by direct rules given for this special sacrifice but) by transfer (atideśa; by transferring or extending the rules given for the fundamental form to the modification). Detached injunctions are injunctions of general validity (while rules which are not detached but under the influence of some prakaraṇa refer to that particular sacrifice only with which the prakaraṇa connects them).

Syntactical connexion as a means of settling subsidiary relation is of greater weight than prakaraṇa and the rest. Thus f. i. with regard to the mantra (forming a part of the súktaváka) "o Indrágní you accepted this offering etc". This whole mantra is on account of its forming one syntactical whole to be taken as subsidiary to the newmoon-sacrifice only and not, on account of prakaraṇa, as subsidiary to the fullmoon-sacrifice as well. (The súktaváka belongs by prakaraṇa to the darśa-sacrifice as well as to the púrṇamása-sacrifice. It however contains mantras which by their liṅga are marked as belonging to either of these two sacrifices exclusively; so f. i. the mantra "indrágní idaṃ havir ajushetám avívṛidhetáṃ maho jyáyo'krátám" which by the word "indrágní" is shown not to be applicable to the púrṇamása-sacrifice. It might however be maintained that it is sufficient to leave out the one word "indrágní" and that then the remainder of the mantra is to be used at the púrṇamása-sacrifice too, with which it is connected by prakaraṇa. This opinion however is impugned by the Mímáṃsists who maintain that the syntactical connexion binding "indrágní" to the remainder of the mantra is stronger than prakaraṇa and that consequently the whole mantra has to be left out at the púrṇamása-sacrifice.)

Prakaraṇa means interdependence (ubhayákáṅkshá; mutual desire; mutual want of a complement). An example is afforded by the following passage connected with the prayájas "he is to offer the samidh". As in this passage no special fruit (of the offering) is mentioned, the sense merely being "he is to realize by means of offering the samidh", there arises the question "what (is he to realize)?" originating in the want of something to which the offering of the samidh might contribute. And again after the passage about the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice has given rise to the idea "he is to realize paradise by means of the darśapúrṇamása" there arises the question "how (is he to realize paradise)?" originating in the want of something which may contribute towards bringing about the desired result. And thus by mutual interdependence the subsidiary relation in which the prayájas stand to the darśapúrṇamása is established.—This prakaraṇa is of two kinds, great prakaraṇa (maháprakaraṇa) and included prakaraṇa (avántara-prakaraṇa). By the former is to be understood that kind of prakaraṇa which refers to the principal bhávaná (i. e. the energy productive of the fruit of the entire sacrificial action). This great prakaraṇa establishes f. i. the subsidiary relation in which the prayájas etc.

stand to the darśapúrṇamása. Great prakaraṇa takes place with reference to the fundamental forms (prakṛiti) of the sacrifice only, as there only the relation of interdependence or mutual want is found (viz. if a fundamental form of the sacrifice is enjoined there arises at once the want of subsidiaries by means of which the sacrifice can be accomplished ; at the same time statements regarding subsidiaries give rise to the question to what sacrifice these subsidiaries belong). The case is different with regard to the modifications (of the fundamental forms). For there, by the principle of transfer expressed in the words "a modification is to be carried out in the same manner as its fundamental form" the want of something indicating how the action is to be performed is already satisfied and it is therefore impossible that the proper application of the new subsidiaries(1) should be settled by interdependence (there being in this case no mutual want, but a want on one side only viz. on the side of the subsidiaries.) Therefore the application of the new subsidiaries is in the case of a modification settled by place (sthána) only, not by prakaraṇa.—By included prakaraṇa is to be understood prakaraṇa connected with the creative energy belonging to the subsidiary parts of the sacrifice. Included prakaraṇa f. i. establishes the subsidiary relation in which the act of stepping forward (abhikramaṇa) stands to the oblations called prayájas. Prakaraṇa of this kind is only known by the circumstance of an injunction being inserted in the middle of two others (sandaṃśa ; the inserted injunction being grasped as it were by the two encompassing injunctions as by the two limbs of a pair of tongs). For if this peculiar position is not found all the subsidiaries mentioned (among them the stepping forward) would be taken as expressing the mode of action of the energy productive of the general result (of the sacrifice) and would then be subsidiary to the principal action (as the prayájas are). By the term sandaṃśa is to be understood the position of an injunction between two subsidiaries enjoined with reference to some one subsidiary. An example is furnished by the act of advancing (towards the áhavaníya ; which forms a part of the sacrificial action of offering the prayájas). For

(1) Apúrva in this context means simply "new"; the subsidiaries which do not belong to the prakṛiti but to the vikṛiti only.

there at first a matter subsidiary to the prayájas is mentioned in the words "he is to pour (the butter) out of the upabhṛit (into the juhú) ; for splendour etc."; (after that comes the passage "he for whom knowing this the prayájas are offered pushes his enemies out of these worlds ; stepping forward he is to offer them for victory "); and after this passage again a matter subsidiary to the prayájas is enjoined in the words "he who knows the coupling of the prayájas etc". For this reason the stepping forward which is mentioned in the middle of two things subsidiary to the prayájas is to be considered as itself subsidiary to the latter.(1) For after the idea has arisen that a contribution towards the sacrifice is to be made by means of bringing about a transcendental result by the prayájas, there arises the question "how is the transcendental result to be brought about by means of the prayájas ?" and this want of something teaching the mode of action is satisfied by the stepping forward etc. which actions are enjoined in the middle of matters subsidiary to the prayájas. Nor can the objection be raised that the productive energy connected with the subsidiaries does not stand in need of a mode of action being pointed out ; for such a need actually exists this particular kind of productive energy participating in the general nature of productive energy.

Prakaraṇa directly teaches the application of actions only, and only by means of the latter the application of materials, qualities (which are connected with the actions). When f. i. with regard to the energy tending towards the realization of a certain fruit expressed in the passage "he who desires paradise is to sacrifice" the want of some mode how to bring about the result arises we have to take the set of actions which are mentioned in the sacred text in proximity to the above passage and with regard to which no fruit is mentioned (for if some special fruit were mentioned the set of actions could no longer be considered subsidiary to some other action); this set of actions which stands itself in need of something towards which it might contribute is to be connected with the above passage as indicating the mode of action.

(1) For a different argumentation with regard to the same passage see J. N. M. V. p. 100.—The practical issue of the decision is that only the person concerned with the prayájas has to step forward and not all those engaged in the darśapúrṇamása.

That actions only can satisfy the want of the mode of procedure is a matter of common experience. For if with regard to sentences like "the hand is to cleave by means of the axe" the question is asked "how (is the cleaving performed)?", the proper answer does not lie in the word "hand" although enunciated, but rather in the raising and lowering of the axe, the sense being "he is to cleave by raising and lowering the axe by means of the hand"; and thus the hand is connected with the act of cleaving only by means of the raising and lowering as is known to every body.

Prakaraṇa has greater weight than position (sthána) and the following means of proof. For this reason the acts like dicing etc. which are enjoined in the passage "he is to play at dice with a Rájanya" are, although they are read in the holy text in proximity to the abhishechaníya-ceremony and therefore would on the ground of position be subsidiary to the latter, in reality subsidiary to the rájasúya-sacrifice on the ground of prakaraṇa.

By position (sthána) is to be understood equality of place. It is of two kinds, being either equality of place according to the text (páṭhasádeśya) or equality of place according to the performance (anushṭhána-sádeśya). The term "krama" (order of succession) has the same meaning as sthána (position).

Equality of place according to the text again is of two different kinds, being either text according to number or else text according to proximity.

An example of text according to number is offered by the following passages "he spreads a cake on eleven potsherds to Indrágní" and "he spreads a cake on twelve potsherds to Viśvánara". With regard to these passages which are found in the text in the given order the application of the yájyá and anuvákya mantras (indrágní rochaná divaḥ etc.) is settled according to "text according to number" i. e. the first mantra is applied to the first sacrificial action, the second mantra to the second action. For if with regard to the mantra read in the first place the question arises "to what purpose does it serve"?, the sacrificial action enjoined in the first place presents itself first as they both occupy corresponding places. And so with regard to the second mantra also.—That things subsidiary to a modification, which things are enjoined with refer-

ence to subsidiaries of a fundamental form and stand in the middle of two injunctions, belong to the modification is to be concluded from "text according to proximity." So f. i. in the case of the oblations called ámanahomas (Taitt. S. II. 3. 9). For as with regard to them the want of something to which they may refer arises, the transcendental result consequent on a certain modified form of the sacrifice naturally connects itself as fruit (with these oblations), because this modified form readily presents itself (the modified form of the sacrifice which is mentioned in the holy text close by the ámana-homas is the kámyeshṭi the originative injunction of which is contained in the words "vaiśvadevíṃ sáṃgrahaṇíṃ nirvaped grámakámaḥ").—If on the other hand (instead of the named oblations being considered subsidiary to a certain modification) an independent fruit were assumed for them (they being considered to produce a special apúrva of their own) their being mentioned in the sacred text in immediate proximity to some modified form would be purposeless.—

Equality of place according to the performance shows f. i. that the different details stated with regard to the sacrificial animal refer to the animal sacrificed to Agníshomau; for the sacrifice of the animal offered to Agníshomau is performed on the aupavasathya day and on the same day (i. e. among the description of the ceremonies to be performed on that day) the details concerning the animal sacrifice are stated. And as now there arises the want of something towards which these details might contribute the transcendental result produced by the animal sacrifice which presents itself as something to be achieved naturally connects itself as that which is to be realized (by means of these details).—Position (sthána) is of greater weight than samákhyá (name). For this reason the mantra about purification (śundhadhvaṃ daivyáya karmaṇe etc.) stands in subsidiary relation to the sánnáyya-vessel only as it is read in proximity to these vessels, and does not on account of the title "paurodáśikam" (i. e. referring to the sacrificial cake; the name of that chapter which treats of the offering of the sacrificial cake) stand in subsidiary relation to all the vessels connected with the sacrificial cake.

By "name" (samákhyá) are to be understood words the meaning of

which is found by decomposing them into their elements (yaugikaḥ śabdaḥ).—It is of two kinds belonging either to the language of the Veda or to common language. An example of the former kind is furnished by the vedic term "hotṛichamasaḥ", from which we conclude that the hotṛi stands in subsidiary relation to the drinking of (the contents of) the cup called chamasa. (The term "chamasa" which has to be derived from the root cham "to sip" and signifies the cup from which the soma is drunk shows that the soma contained in the cup is to be drunk by the hotṛi; for which circumstance a more direct rule is not given). The word "ádhvaryava" on the other hand which belongs to common language points out that the adhvaryu stands in subsidiary relation to different things (mentioned in the ádhvaryava káṇḍa.)(1) This is a short statement of the power of samákhyá.

Thus we have shortly explained the six means of proof, direct enunciation etc., assisted by which injunctions of application—as f. i. he is to offer the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice contributing towards it with the samidhs etc.—teach the proper application of subsidiary matters. These subsidiaries are of two kinds being either accomplished things or actions. By accomplished things we understand species (játi), substances (dravya), numbers (saṃkhyá) etc.(2) All these have a visible purpose only. Subsidiary actions are again of two different kinds, being either secondary (guṇakarma) or primary (pradhánakarma). These same two classes of actions are also called actions contributing (towards the general result of the sacrifice) through an intermediate step (sannipatyopakáraka) and actions contributing (towards the general result) immediately or directly (árádupakáraka). By actions of the former kind we understand actions enjoined with reference to some substance etc. which latter is itself subsidiary to some other action. Of this kind are f. i. the beating of the rice-grains (in order to detach them from the husks), sprinkling with water etc. These actions

(1) By "common language" we have to understand the technical terms used by the yájnikas, in so far as they are not found in the text of the Veda itself.

(2) Species as f. i. the generic character of an animal which is offered as a sacrifice; substances like rice-grains etc.; number as f. i. the singularity, duality etc of the things used for the sacrifice —All these contribute towards the accomplishment of the svarúpa, the outward form of the sacrifice.

are either such as have a seen effect or such as have an unseen effect or such as have a seen as well as an unseen effect. To the first class belongs f. i. the beating of the rice-grains (the effect of which is their being detached from the husks); to the second class belongs f. i. the sprinkling with water (which does not produce a visible effect on the rice-grains); to the third class belong (the actions referring to) the animal, the sacrificial cake etc., for these actions produce an unseen result in as far as they comprise the offering of a certain material (viz. the material offered in the sacrifice), while at the same time in as far as they are performed with regard to a certain divinity they produce a visible result viz. the remembrance of the divinity.(1) By an action contributing directly (árádupakáraka) we understand an action which is merely enjoined, without reference to any substance etc. As f. i. the prayájas. Such actions are of use only in originating the highest transcendental result (paramápúrva; the transcendental result produced by the sacrificial action in its totality); while the actions contributing through an intermediate step are of use also for the outward form of the sacrifice by means of their producing a modification (saṃskára) of the material of the sacrifice and of the divinity (whereby they produce the so-called utpatty-apúrva).(2) The same kind of actions are also called inherent actions (áśrayikarma; viz. inherent in some substance, divinity etc.).—Herewith we have given a short account of the injunctions of application.

Prayoga-vidhi, injunction of performance, is that injunction which intimates speediness of performance. This kind of injunction (is not a separate one, there being no passages which are merely prayogavidhi and nothing else but) consists simply in the injunction of the main sacrificial action (as f. i. "he who is desirous of paradise is to offer the darśapúrṇamása-sacrifice")

(1) For the sacrifice is the parting with a certain substance (dravyatyága) with a view to—or aiming at—a certain divinity (devatoddeśena).—Regarding the relation of the different kinds of actions to the apúrva cp. J. N. M. V. p. 57.

(2) On the different kinds of apúrva see—in addition to J. N. M. V. p. 57.—the instructive article अपूर्व in Goldstücker's Sanskrit Dictionary. It is however hardly correct to render "apúrva", as G. does, by "the unseen or transcendental power of a religious or sacrificial act which produces the desired result at another time etc."; for apúrva is not the power of producing a result but a result itself.

which forms one syntactical whole with the sentences enjoining subsidiary things (the prayájas etc.); for this (injunction of the main action etc.) causing the execution of the main action with all its subsidiaries enjoins speediness of the performance which latter expression means as much as absence of delay (or pause), as there is no special means of proof for delay. Nor must it be objected that there also is no special means of proof for the absence of delay. For if (the things enjoined in the different injunctions were to be done) with delay, they could not be done connectedly (together; saha) and that they are to be done connectedly is understood from the circumstance of the injunctions referring to the chief action and its subsidiaries forming one syntactical whole. Just as we see that in common life two things which are done with delay (as f. i. the one thing to-day the other to-morrow) are never said to be done "together" (or "connectedly"). This absence of delay is obtained when a fixed order is followed; for otherwise there arise doubts regarding the order of consecution of the different actions and the whole performance is spoiled. Therefore an injunction of performance enjoins, for the purpose of bringing about speediness of the performance of what it enjoins, at the same time a fixed order which order is to be taken as a special attribute of the things enjoined (if it were not taken as a mere attribute of the things enjoined but as an independent thing the prayogavidhi would be open to the reproach of vákyabheda). For this reason "injunction of performance" is also defined as that injunction which teaches the order of the subsidiaries. By "order" (krama) we understand a particular kind of extension or rather (extension being applicable to coexistent things too) the relation of (different things) being earlier and later with regard to each other. For settling this order of succession (of different actions) we have six means of proof, viz. direct enunciation (śruti), sense (artha), text (páṭha), position (sthána), principal matter (mukhya), procedure (pravṛitti). By direct enunciation (śruti) we understand any passage whose purport it is to intimate order of succession. It is of two kinds, having either the purport of intimating merely order of succession or the purport of intimating something particularized by order of succession. An example of the former kind is the passage "having prepared the veda he is to prepare the vedi"; this passage merely has the purport of intimating an order of succession; for the preparation of the vedi is already taught by another passage. (The śruti in the above quoted passage is contained in the suffix ktvá of kṛitvá—vedam kṛitvá vedim karoti. The passage contains the statement of the relative order of preparation of veda and vedi, in the way of anuváda to those other passages which have the purpose of enjoining the preparation of the two mentioned things independent of their relative order in time). On the other hand the passage "the first draught belongs to the Vashaṭ-kartṛi" has the purpose of enjoining a thing (viz. drinking) particularized by a certain order; for it can not be taken as enjoining order only with reference to the drinking because this would involve a break of the unity of syntactical construction. (The passage must be taken as containing information of a double nature as there is no other passage enjoining the act of drinking by the vashaṭ-kartṛi. It might now be maintained that it enjoins two altogether different things, firstly the drinking, secondly the place of this act with regard to other acts. But as this assumption would involve vákyabheda, it is thought more proper to declare that the passage enjoins only one thing particularized by a second one.—Cp. the analogous case of "somena yajeta"). Direct enunciation has greater weight than the other means of proof, because the latter obtain their authority only by means of a direct statement founded on them being constructed. For this reason the cup devoted to the aśvinau is offered in the tenth place (among the cups offered during the Jyotishṭoma) because there is the direct statement "the cup for the Aśvinau is to be offered as the tenth"; although one might think that is to be offered as the third according to the order in which the cups are mentioned in the sacred text. (Starting from the aindraváyava graha we find the áśvina graha mentioned in the third place, Taitt. S. I. 4. 6; VI. 4. 9, so that according to páṭha it ought to be offered in the third place; but the direct statement contained in the word "tenth" of the passage quoted above is stronger than páṭha and settles the order of performance.—The

principle according to which the order of precedence of the different means of proof is determined in the case of krama is the same as the one followed in the case of the means of proof assisting viniyoga-vidhi. In the present example f. i. we might, on the ground of the ásvina graha being mentioned in the text in the third place, construct an injunction containing a śruti viz. "he is to offer the ásvina graha in the third place", the silent presumption being that such an arrangement would not be impossible, not against artha, which latter must be satisfied before we can pass from páṭha to śruti. But this constructed injunction would be met and invalidated by an injunction found ready in the holy text viz. "the cup for the aśvinau is offered in the tenth place").—That order of succession which is settled according to the demands of the purpose (for which different actions are performed) is called order according to the sense. As f. i. the relative order of the agnihotra-offering and the cooking of rice-gruel; to which actions the two passages "he is to offer the agnihotra" and "he is to cook the rice-gruel" refer. For as the rice-gruel serves the purpose of the agnihotra its cooking, according to the demands of the purpose, is to be accomplished first.—This order of succession according to the sense is stronger than order of succession according to the text. For if, the purpose as a means whereby to settle order of succession being set aside, the actions were performed according to the order of the text the cooking of the rice-gruel could merely have an unseen purpose, for if done after the oblation it could not serve any visible purpose. (But this would run counter to the general principle of never assuming an unseen purpose when a visible one can be established; hence the decision).—The order of succession of sentences which intimate certain things is called order of succession according to the text and according to it the order of succession of the things themselves is settled. For the sentences following upon each other in the text in a certain order produce when being read the ideas of the things (of which they treat) in the same order and according to the order of the ideas the order of the execution of the things is settled.—This text (páṭha) is twofold, text of the mantras and text of the Bráhmaṇa-passages. The order f. i.

which is settled for the cake offered to Agni and the cake offered to Agníshomau by means of the order in which the yájyá and anuvákya mantras are read in the text, is founded upon mantra-text. (The injunction referring to the agníshomíya-cake is found in the second anuváka of the Taittiríya-bráhmaṇa, while the passage enjoining the ágneya cake occurs in the third anuváka. From this it might be concluded that at the fullmoon-sacrifice the agníshomíya cake is to be offered before the ágneya cake. The order however of the mantras accompanying the two offerings, as found in the mantra-káṇḍa, establishes the contrary.) Mantra-text is of greater weight than bráhmaṇa-text, because the mantra text is more intimately connected with the actual performance of the sacrifice than the bráhmaṇa-text. For the latter gives to understand that such and such a thing is to be done, outside of the sacrifice (during which the bráhmaṇa-text is not itself of actual use) and has thereby accomplished its purpose. The mantras on the other hand are actually employed at the time of the performance of the sacrifice the order of the performance depending on the order in which the single parts of the performance are remembered and as the order of remembrance again depends on the order of the mantras (whose property it is to remind one), the mantra-text forms an essential part of the performance of the sacrifice.—The order of succession of the prayájas which is derived from the order of the text of certain injunctions (viz. "he offers the samidhs" "he offers tanúnapát" etc.) is based on the order of the bráhmaṇa-text. For although the bráhmaṇa-passages may be said to have fulfilled their purpose by enjoining a certain thing, nevertheless—in the absence of some other passage pointing out the order of succession of the prayájas etc., the same bráhmaṇa-passages are to be accepted as pointing out the order of the succession as well.(1)—By "position" (sthána) is to be understood presentation, presenting one's self (upasthiti) for if at the place of something (as f. i. in the example given below at the place of the savaníya) something else is performed (as f. i. the ag-

(1) The commentary here takes a different view and maintains, as it appears rightly, that the order of succession of the prayájas is founded on mantra-text, not bráhmaṇa-text.

níshomíya and ánubandhya in the sacrifice called sádyaskra), that mentioned something (f. i. the savaníya) presents itself first after the thing by which it is regularly preceded (f. i. the ásvinagrahaṇa) has been performed and it is therefore proper that it should be performed first. For this reason in the soma-sacrifice called sádyaskra where the three animal sacrifices viz. the agníshomíya, the savaníya and the ánubandhya have to be performed together (i. e. in immediate consecution) in the place of the savaníya (i. e. at that point of the sacrifice where in the fundamental form—the agnishṭoma—the savaníya alone is offered) the savaníya animal has to be offered first, the two others afterwards, as in that place after the offering of the ásvina cup the savaníya first presents itself to the mind. For to the jyotishṭoma (of which the sádyaskra is a modification) belong three animal sacrifices, the agníshomíya, the savaníya and the ánubandhya. These three have different places, the agníshomíya being offered on the upavasatha-day, the savaníya at the time of the pressing of the soma and the ánubandhya at the end of the sacrifice. Sádyaskra now is the name of a particular somasacrifice which on account of its indefiniteness (i. e. on account of no special divinity being mentioned with regard to it) is to be considered as a mere modification of the jyotishṭoma. Therefore the three animal sacrifices are established for the sádyaskra also by the original injunction (which establishes them for the prakṛiti-form i. e. the agnishṭoma and which has to be transferred to the different vikṛitis also). That there they have to be performed together (not on different days) is seen from the direct statement "he offers the animals together." This common sacrifice of the three animals has to be performed at the place of the savaníya (i. e. at that point of the sacrifice where in the case of the agnishṭoma the savaníya alone is offered) since that place is near to the principal sacrificial action (of all somasacrifices viz. the pressing of the soma) and since the fault of some of the animal sacrifices being removed from their proper places is the same (on whatever day they may be performed together). For if the three sacrifices are performed at the place of the savaníya, only the agníshomíya and the ánubandhya are removed from their proper places; while in the case of the three sacrifices being performed

either on the day of the agníshomíya or on the day of the ánubandhya all three are removed from their proper places (for if they are performed on the day of the agníshomíya pasu the latter itself can not be said to have its proper place as it thereby is removed from the pressing of the soma proximity to which becomes indispensable as soon as the injunction of all the three sacrifices having to be performed together is observed; the same reasoning if applied to the ánubandhya-pasu shows that the ánubandhya-day is not the proper one).(1) As we now read in the description of the fundamental form (of the sádyaskra i. e. the jyotishṭoma) "having done the ásvina cup and having tied round the sacrificial post with a thrice-twisted string he leads on the savaníya pasu" and thereby see that the sacrifice of the savaníya pasu is enjoined after the taking of the ásvina cup, the savaníya presents itself to the mind also in the sádyaskra immediately after the taking of the ásvina cup and thus, according to position (sthána) it is proper that it should be performed first. The two other animal sacrifices have to be performed after the savaníya in the manner explained (viz. in the first páda of Adhy. V of the Mímáṃsá, where the commentators state that the agníshomíya has to precede the ánubandhya).—By order founded on the principal matter (mukhya) we understand the order of the subsidiary matters belonging to some performance in as far as it is settled by the order of the principal matters. For in whatever order the principal matters are performed in the same order the subsidiary matters belonging to them are performed, since in this manner all subsidiary matters are distant from the principal matters in the same degree. If on the contrary the subsidiary matters were performed in an inverse order (compared with the order of the principal matters) the consequence would be that some subsidiary matters would be

(1) For the details of the lengthy and unimportant discussion referring to the sthánátikramasámya see the commentary on the Arthasaṃgraha in the lithographed Benares edition. (It is to be remarked that the text of the múla of the passage is very incorrect in the lithographed edition a piece of the commentary having got mixed up with it).—In the Jaim. N. M. V. the pradhánasomapratyásatti is the only—and quite sufficient—reason for the three animals being sacrificed on the sutyá-day.—In Golstücker's edition of J. N. M. V. p. 224 l. 3 read °छाभात् । तेषु.

as near as possible to their principal matters and others again as far away as possible; and this would of course be improper, as it would interfere with the connectedness of actions intimated by the injunction of performance. Therefore the order of succession of the principal things determines the order of the subsidiaries as well. Thus f. i. a part of the (ghee which is the) remainder of the prayájas is at first poured over the oblation to Agni and after that another portion over the sour milk offered to Indra, because the sacrifice to Agni precedes in time the sacrifice to Indra. In this manner the two acts of pouring ghee are separated from the principal actions to which they belong (viz. the offering of the two oblations) in the same manner viz. by one intervening act (1. pouring of ghee on the ágneya oblation 2. pouring of ghee on the aindra oblation 3. offering of the ágneya 4. offering of the aindra); while in the case of the reverse order being adopted for the pouring of ghee the pouring of ghee on the ágneya and the offering of the ágneya would follow on each other immediately and on the other hand the pouring of ghee on the aindra oblation and the offering of the aindra oblation would be separated from each other by two intervening acts (viz. the pouring of ghee on the ágneya and the offering of the ágneya); and this, as already remarked, would be improper. Order founded on the principal matter is weaker than order according to the text (páṭhakrama); for the former determines the order (of the sacrificial acts) in a retarded manner only because it depends on the determination of the order of the principal actions which determination itself depends on some other means of proof. Order according to the text on the other hand is of a different kind as it merely depends on the order of the text as it is found in the Veda, which latter order is independent of anything else; it is therefore of greater weight.—On the other hand it is of greater authority than order founded on procedure (pravṛitti); for in the case of order founded on procedure many subsidiary matters are distant from the principal matter while they are near to it in the case of mukhya krama (about pravṛitti-krama see further on).

If in the case of several principal matters (or actions) being performed together and the subsidiary actions connected with

them having to be performed seriatim, the order of succession of the second, third etc. subsidiary actions is regulated according to the order of the subsidiary action performed first, that order of succession is called order according to procedure (pravṛitti). So f. i. in the case of the subsidiary actions connected with the animal sacrifices offered to Prajápati (during the vájapeya where seventeen animals are offered to Prajápati), with regard to which we read "having offered the vaiśvadeva oblation they proceed with the animals for Prajápati". In this sentence the animals meant for Prájápati are, as pointed out by the third case termination, enjoined, together with the actions constituting the mode of procedure, as having to be offered at one time. Consequently they (the sacrifices of the animals) as well as the subsidiary actions connected therewith as the leading on, the tying to the sacrificial post etc. (of the victims) have to be performed together (or connectedly, saha). This performing together becomes, with regard to (the actual sacrifice of) the prájápatya animals, possible by performing the actual sacrifice (of all of them) at the same time as one divinity (viz. Prajápati) is fixed (for all of them).(1) On the other hand it is impossible to perform all the subsidiary actions as the leading on, the tying to the sacrificial post etc. at the same time and the only method of performing them *together* is therefore to perform them in such a manner as to separate the subsidiary actions to the least possible degree from the principal actions. For this end one performs at first the leading on of one animal and after that the leading on of the second and follows the same order with regard to the tying to the post etc. And thus selecting from among the animals about to be offered to Prajápati a certain one, one begins with it and performs the same subsidiary action with regard to all animals; after this one performs the second subsidiary action on the same animal on which the first one had been performed and again proceeds following the same order with regard to all other animals. The order of succession determined according to this principle is called order of succession according

(1) The Comm. remarks that another reading is "sampratipannadevatákálatvena", and that the time meant is the time after the performance of the vaiśvadeví while the divinity is Prajápati.

to procedure. It is of less weight than order of succession founded on direct statement etc.—Herewith we have given a short account of injunction of performance by defining the six different kinds of order of succession.

By injunction of claim or qualification (adhikáravidhi) we understand that kind of injunction which intimates the ownership with regard to some result which is brought about by some action. By "ownership" we understand the position of one who enjoys the result.—To this class of injunctions belongs f. i. the passage "he who is desirous of paradise is to sacrifice"; which passage while it enjoins the sacrifice with regard to paradise intimates the state of enjoyment of the result consequent on the sacrificial action by him who is desirous of paradise.—Another example is the passage "he whose houses Agni should burn down after he has constructed the holy fires, is to offer to the merciful Agni a cake on eight potsherds." This passage enjoining a certain sacrificial action on the occasion of a conflagration etc. intimates the ownership of him who acts on the mentioned occasion with regard to a result which consists in averting a calamity and which is produced by the sacrificial action.—In the same way the passage "he is daily to perform the sandhyá" intimates the ownership of him who leads a pure life, observing the proper times for all his duties, with regard to a fruit viz. the avoidance of disaster which ensues on the proper performance of the sandhyá.

This kind of ownership with regard to some result belongs to him only who is distinguished by the necessary qualification (adhikára). By qualification we understand that which, in the passages containing injunctions, is mentioned as a distinguishing attribute of the person (whom the injunction concerns). This is, in the case of those sacrifices which are performed for the fulfillment of a certain wish, the wish for the particular result; in the case of the sacrifices performed on a special occasion the ascertainment of the occasion; in the case of acts of permanent obligation as f. i. the performance of the sandhyá the circumstance of the man leading a pure life and observing the proper times for all his duties. For this reason too the passage "a king who is desirous of the kingship of the heavenly world

is to perform the rájasúya-sacrifice" notwithstanding its enjoining (the rájasúya) with a view to the kingship of the heavenly world does not intimate that the enjoyment of the result will be obtained by any one who desires the kingship of the heavenly world, but only by him who being at the same time a king is desirous of the kingship of the heavenly world; for the passage contains a clear statement of the kingly dignity being a necessary attribute of the qualified person.—Sometimes a necessary attribute of the qualified person is to be understood although it may not be directly stated as an attribute of the person. This is the case f. i. with regard to the knowledge dependent on the injunction enforcing the study of the Veda. (This knowledge is a necessary qualification for any one who wishes to perform sacrifices,) since all the injunctions of sacrifices as they require a knowledge of the matters (used in the sacrifice) are given for those only who have acquired a knowledge of these matters in consequence of complying with the injunction inculcating the study of the Veda. In the same manner the quality of being provided with the sacred fires—which quality is obtained by the first construction of the fires—is a necessary qualification for all sacrificial acts which are to be effected by means of the holy fires; for as all these sacrifices can not be performed without the fires the injunctions prescribing them can be given for those only who by the construction of the fires have acquired the attribute of being owners of the sacred fires. In the same manner capability (to perform the duty is an understood qualification); for the injunction applies only to those who are capable (by bodily strength and health, mental power etc.) to carry it out, according to the principle expressed in the words "power (of understanding on the part of the hearer) cooperates with the verbs expressing a certain sense" (the verbs although possessing a certain sense have no effect on a person not able to understand it.)—Herewith we close the discussion of that part of the Veda which is denoted by the name "Injunction".

"Mantras" serve to recall to memory the matters connected with the sacrificial performance. By this their property of recalling to memory the matters mentioned they have a purpose and it is not to be supposed that their enunciation merely tends to produce

some unseen result, as it would be improper to assume merely an unseen result while a visible result (in this case the circumstance of the performer of the sacrifice being reminded of certain things) exists. Nor can it be maintained that the recitation of the mantras is purposeless because the visible end of reminding one of certain things can be obtained by other means also (as f. i. by the bráhmaṇa-passages of the Veda which would point out the divinities etc. of the sacrifice even without being combined with the mantra-passages); for (the exclusive use of the mantras for the purpose) is founded on an injunction of a necessary arrangement (niyama-vidhi) according to which the mentioned matters are to be recalled to memory by means of the mantras only (not by any other means). By an injunction of necessary arrangement is to be understood an injunction which, in the case of one particular instrument being established (by some other means of proof) with regard to an action which can be performed by various instruments, establishes the use of some other instrument which is not yet established (by other means of proof). As it is said "An injunction takes place when something is absolutely non-established; an injunction of necessary arrangement when one alternative is already established; when both alternatives are already established, (the injunction required) is called limitation (parisaṃkhyá)." The sense of this passage is as follows.—That kind of injunction which establishes something not established by any other means of proof is called an injunction of something new (apúrva-vidhi) (or simply "injunction" as in the quoted śloka). Such an injunction is contained f. i. in the passage "he who is desirous of paradise is to sacrifice"; for it enjoins a sacrifice for the purpose of obtaining paradise which is not established by any other means of proof.—That kind of injunction which establishes something that is partially (i. e. on certain occasions) non-established is called an injunction of necessary arrangement (niyama-vidhi); as f. i. the passage "he is to beat the rice-grains." If it is asked how this passage can be said to establish something partially non-established, we answer: in the following manner. The passage does not intimate that the beating of the ricegrains has the effect of clearing them from the husks; (for a special passage intimating this would be altogether unnecessary)

as that circumstance is well known from positive and negative instances (it being a matter of common observation that the rice-grains if beaten are freed from their husks while the husks remain attached to the grains when the latter are not beaten). But the passage has the purpose of a niyama whereby is to be understood the supplying of a part (hitherto) non-established. For as the freeing of the grains from the husks can be effected by more than one means, one might leave aside the beating and begin to make use of some other means (f. i. of the finger-nails); for this case now the beating being non-established the above quoted injunction effects the supplying of the non-established part, viz. the injunction of the beating. Thus in a so-called injunction of niyama the purport of the sentence is a necessary arrangement which consists in a non-established part being supplied. And this (in the quoted example) means as much as the injunction of the partially non-established beating of the rice-grains.—That kind of injunction which has the purpose of excluding one of two alternatives both of which are established by some other means is called injunction of limitation (parisaṃkhyá-vidhi). As f. i. the passage "five animals from among the animals having five nails may be eaten (are lawful for food)" This passage has not the purpose of establishing the eating of animals having five nails (is therefore not an apúrva-vidhi), as their being used for food is already established (without any special rule) by the natural appetite of man. Nor has it the purpose of a necessary arrangement, as the eating of animals having five nails and the eating of animals not having five nails is established simultaneously (the two not excluding each other) and it can therefore not be said that the eating of animals having five nails is partially non-established. For these reasons the purpose of the passage must be to exclude the eating of animals not having five nails and it therefore is an injunction of limitation. Injunctions of this kind are of two different kinds, the limitation being either directly stated (śrauta) or implied (lákshaṇika). An example of the former kind is afforded by the passage "for there only they sing"; for here the (directly enunciated) word "only" intimates the exclusion of all stotras except the pavamána. An example of implied limitation is afforded by the mentioned

passage "five animals having five nails may be eaten"; for this passage does not contain any word which directly expresses the exclusion of other animals. For this reason merely implied limitation must be admitted to be affected with three different imperfections. These are firstly, setting aside of what is directly mentioned (in favour of something implied only), secondly assumption of something which is not directly stated and thirdly rejection of something already established (by other means). As is said in the śloka "on account of setting aside the matter directly stated and assuming a matter not directly stated and rejecting something established limitation is affected with three vices." (In the quoted passage the details of the three shortcomings are as follows). The thing directly stated which is to be set aside is the eating of animals with five nails. The matter not directly stated which is to be assumed is the exclusion of the eating of animals not having five nails. And the matter already established which is rejected is the eating of animals not having five nails (the means by which it is established being man's natural appetite). Two of these three imperfections lie merely in the words while the rejection of something established lies in the matter itself.

(Finally it must be remarked that) Those mantras which do not possess the power of reminding one of the things connected with the sacrificial performance must, since no other alternative is left, be assumed to contribute towards the unseen result by the mere circumstance of their being uttered and they are therefore not purposeless.

"Names" (as forming one of the constituent parts of the Veda) have a purpose by their defining (or limiting) the matter enjoined. So f. i. the word "udbhidá" in the passage "he who is desirous of cattle is to sacrifice with the udbhid (i. e. is to perform the sacrifice called udbhid)." In this passage the word "udbhid" is the name of a sacrifice and effects the limitation of the matter (the sacrifice) enjoined. This is to be understood as follows. The passage by pointing out a certain result enjoins a sacrifice not established elsewhere. As it does not enjoin sacrifices in general (that it does not do this is shown by the fact of a special result being mentioned) it must be assumed to enjoin a special sacrifice. If now the

question arises what special sacrifice is meant, we learn from the word "udbhid" that the sacrifice called udbhid is intended. Udbhidá taken as a name fits into the sentence by means of the relation of inhering in the same abode or coordination (sámánádhikaraṇya), the sense of the whole passage being "he is to realize cattle by means of udbhid the sacrifice" (in which sentence the two words "udbhidá" and "yágena" are coordinate).—That certain words found in the Veda have to be considered as names appears from one or the other of four reasons 1. from the danger of possessive indication 2. from the danger of split of the sentence 3. on account of another scriptural passage declaring it 4. on account of the comparison with it (for the details of which reasons see the following).

In the passage already quoted viz. "he who is desirous of cattle is to sacrifice with the udbhid" the word "udbhidá" must be assumed to be the name of a sacrifice on account of the danger of possessive indication. This appears from the following reasoning. (If udbhid did not denote a particular sacrifice, the only other alternative would be to assume that it denotes a certain instrument by means of which the sacrifice is performed; an explanation which might appear to be founded on the etymology of the word.—But then the following difficulties present themselves) in the first place it is not proper to suppose that the passage contains the injunction of the sacrifice with a view to the result and at the same time the injunction of some secondary matter (an instrument) with a view to the sacrifice; for this assumption would involve a split of the sentence (two different matters being enjoined in one sentence). In the second place (if somebody should propose an other explanation free from the mentioned defect) if the word "udbhidá" is supposed to express merely a secondary matter (an instrument) it would have to be said—as the sacrifice itself is not established by any other passage—that the passage enjoins a sacrificial action distinguished by a certain secondary matter, so that the sense would be "he is to realize cattle by means of a sacrifice distinguished by the udbhid." But in all such injunctions of sacrifices distinguished by some secondary matter the assumption of possessive indication has to be made, as already explained. (It is therefore preferable to take udbhid as the name of a certain sacrifice).

In the passage "he who is desirous of cattle is to sacrifice with the chitrá" chitrá is to be taken as denoting a certain sacrifice, because not doing so would entail a split of the sentence. For it would not be legitimate to assume that the passage enjoins a sacrifice distinguished by some secondary matter (on which assumption the sense would be "he is to realize cattle by means of a sacrifice connected with some secondary matter called chitrá); for the secondary matter is already enjoined by another passage—viz. the one which runs "sour milk, honey, milk, ghee, grain, water, rice, all this mixed is offered to Prajápati"—and it is therefore impossible to consider the above passage as enjoining a sacrifice distinguished by the secondary matter (for the consequence of the latter assumption would be that the secondary matter is enjoined twice). And again if we assumed that the passage enjoins at the same time the connection of the fruit with the sacrifice and the connexion of the secondary matter with the sacrifice, the consequence would be a split of the sentence. For these reasons the word "chitrá" is to be considered as the name of a sacrifice and if we thus explain the passage as meaning "he is to realize cattle by means of the chitrá-sacrifice" no split of the sentence takes place as the word chitrá then fits into the sentence in the way of grammatical coordination. The name "chitrá" for the oblation in question is quite proper as it consists of various substances.

In the passage "he offers the agnihotra" the word "agnihotra" must be taken as the name of a sacrifice, on account of (another) scriptural passage declaring or establishing that viz. the secondary matter belonging to the sacrifice. But—somebody might ask—why should the passage not contain the injunction of a secondary matter?—We reply that this cannot be admitted. For if you should assume that the word agnihotra is a compound the first part of which has the sense of a locative so that it would mean that sacrifice in which an oblation is made into the fire and that therefore the passage enjoins the fire as a secondary matter viz. as the place of the oblation, we point out that such an injunction would be useless because the fire as the place of the oblation is already established by another passage viz. "when he offers the oblation in the áhavaníya."—If on the other hand you say that the compound is to be explained by

means of a dative viz. the sacrifice in which an oblation is made to Agni so that the passage would enjoin the divinity Agni as a secondary matter we reply that this too is inadmissible because the divinity of the sacrifice is already established by another passage. To the question what that passage is different answers are given. Some maintain that it is the following one "that he offers an oblation in the evening to Agni and Prajápati." Others say that Agni as the divinity of the oblation is established by the mantra "Agni is light, light is Agni, sváhá." But—it might be remarked—if Agni is established by the mantra-text, he is refuted by Prajápati (i. e. to be set aside in favour of Prajápati) as the divinity of the sacrifice, according to the rule that a mantra has less power (to establish the divinity of a sacrifice) than a dative (such as in the former of the two passages quoted above establishes Prajápati). As it is said "a divinity is established either by a taddhita-formation or by a dative or by a mantra, the power of these three means of proof decreasing according to the order in which they are mentioned." To this we reply that the case lies differently. The passage "that in the evening he offers an oblation to Agni and Prajápati" does not merely enjoin Prajápati but makes an additional statement about Agni who is already established by the mantra ("Agni is light" etc.) and enjoins in addition to him Prajápati; thus, Prajápati not being enjoined alone, the passage does not refute Agni. —Nor can it be said that the passage contains an injunction of two divinities combined (instead of containing an "anuváda" with regard to one and an injunction of the other). For the explanation according to which the passage enjoins Prajápati only while it merely contains an additional statement referring to Agni already established by another passage is easier and more natural than the other one according to which it enjoins two divinities combined. —(To return to the general matter and to give another example of námadheyatvam being proved by tatprakhyáśástra). In the same manner the pieces of firewood called samidh and other things are established as the divinities of the prayája-oblations by means of the mantras "the samidhs may partake of the butter etc." and therefore the words "samidh" etc. which occur in the injunctions "he sacrifices the samidh" etc. are to be taken as names of certain

sacrifices (not as denoting secondary matters) on account of another scriptural passage declaratory of it.

In the passage "he is to sacrifice attacking with the śyena" the word śyena is to be taken as the name of a sacrifice (and not as denoting the material of the sacrifice) on account of "the comparison with it (on account of the comparison of the sacrificial act with a falcon, which comparison is contained in an arthaváda-passage) as this comparison can not take place in any other way (but on the assumption of śyena denoting a certain sacrifice). This appears from the following reasoning. Whatever is enjoined (in an injunction) is glorified (in the corresponding arthaváda-passage). If now the injunction was meant to enjoin the falcon (as the material of the sacrifice), the arthaváda-passages would have to contain a praise of the falcon. But the arthaváda-passage "for as the falcon swooping down seizes his prey thus he (the sacrificer) swooping down seizes his hating enemy" can not be used as a praise of the falcon as it clearly effects the praise of something else by means of comparing it to a falcon. Nor can the falcon be praised by its being compared to itself, as in each comparison the quality of being that to which something is compared and the quality of being that which is compared to something reside in different things.—If on the contrary the passage enjoins a sacrifice named śyena then the arthaváda-passage is able to effect the praise of the sacrifice by comparing it to a falcon. Thus the word śyena must be taken as denoting a sacrifice on account of the "comparison with it."

(In addition to these four determining reasons which oblige us to explain certain words as names of sacrifices) Some assume a fifth determining reason of this kind viz. the greater weight of the secondary matter as taught in the originative injunction (utpatti). As an example of this they quote the passage "he is to sacrifice with the vaiśvadeva" and declare that the word "vaiśvadeva" is to be taken as the name of a sacrifice and is not meant to enjoin the Viśve-devas as the divinities of the sacrifice, on account of the greater weight of the divinities Agni etc., which are already enjoined by the originative injunctions referring to this sacrifice (which are contained in the passage "ágneyam ashṭakapálam nir-

vapati, saumyam charum etc").—But in reality (it is unnecessary to assume this fifth determining reason) as the circumstance of "vaiśvadeva" being a name already follows from the third of the four reasons detailed above. For with regard to the sacrifice under consideration there is found a statement, in the shape of an arthaváda which establishes the Viśvedevas as a secondary matter, viz. "that all the gods (viśvedevás) sacrificed together that is the viśvedeva-quality of the vaiśvadeva." (It therefore appears that the passage quoted above has not the purpose of pointing out the Viśvedevas as the divinity of the sacrifice and consequently the word "vaiśvadeva" is to be taken as a name).

By prohibition (nishedha) we understand sentences turning off man (from some action); for the purpose of sentences of prohibition lies exclusively in their effecting (man's) turning away from actions which would be the cause of some disadvantage. The details are as follows. In the same manner as an injunction conveying an instigation in order to give effect to its instigatory power intimates that the thing enjoined f. i. the sacrifice is the instrument for obtaining some desired result and thereby instigates the person towards it, in the same manner a prohibitory passage as f. i. "he is not to eat kalañja" conveying the idea of turning off (from some action) in order to give effect to its power of turning off intimates that the thing prohibited as f. i. the eating of kalañja is the instrument of bringing about some highly undesirable result and thereby turns man off from it. If it is now asked how a prohibitory sentence conveys the idea of turning off from something, we answer as follows. The sense of the word "not" is not connected with the sense of the root (of the verb in the prohibitory passage); for although the two words stand in immediate proximity the sense of the root presents itself as standing in subordinate relation to the actual creative energy (árthí bhávaná) which is expressed by the suffix (of words like bhakshayet). For something which presents itself as standing in subordinate relation to one thing can not be connected with something else. Otherwise in the sentence "bring the king's man" (lit. the king-man, rájapurusha) the king himself would enter into relation with the action (while in reality the king only stands in relation to his servant, the

latter in his turn being the object of the action expressed by "bring"). Therefore the sense of the word "not" stands in relation to the sense of the suffix only and here again not to the árthí bhávaná which is expressed by that element (of the suffix) which denotes the verb—for the árthí bhávaná presents itself as standing in subordinate relation to the instigation expressed by that element which denotes the optative—but to the verbal bhávaná denoted by the optative element of the suffix, the verbal bhávaná occupying the chief position of all. Thus the nature of the word "not" is to intimate the thing opposite to the thing with which it (the word "not") is logically connected. As in the sentence "the jar is not" the word "not" standing in connexion with the word "is" intimates the non-existence of the jar which is the opposite to the jar's existence, in the same way here (in prohibitory passages) the word "not" standing in connexion with the optative exclusively intimates the turning-off (from some action) which is the opposite to an instigation towards what is expressed by the optative. For as on hearing an injunctive sentence a person has the idea "that one (the speaker) instigates me", a person on hearing a prohibitory sentence has the conception of a turning off i. e. of an energy tending to produce in him (the hearer) a cessation of activity; which idea may be expressed in the sentence "he is turning me off." Therefore in the case of a prohibitory sentence the exclusive sense of the passage is a turning off.

Where there is however an obstacle in the way of the word "not" being connected with what is expressed by the verbal suffix, it is connected exclusively with what is expressed by the root itself. Such obstacles are of two kinds 1. the beginning with the phrase "his vowed observances are as follows" and 2. the contingent probability of a vikalpa (option).

An example of the former kind is f. i. found in the following passage "he is not to look at the rising Sun" as this sentence is read after a commencement has been made with the words "his vowed observances are as follows." For this reason a paryudása (not a pratishedha) is to be assumed here.(1) For as the word

(1) In the case of "not" being connected with the kriyá the sentence is called a pratishedha, while it is termed a paryudása if the "not" negatives a námau or the dhátvartha; in which cases the "na" might be replaced by the "a" of a compound word as "abráhmaṇa.

"vrata" (vow or vowed observance) has the settled meaning of something which is to be done, the clause "his vowed observances are as follows" begins the enumeration of the vowed observances of the Snátaka as things to be done. If now the question arises "what are the things to be done?", sentences like "he is not to look at the rising sun" must be taken as intimating something to be done. Otherwise the syntactical unity of the former and latter sentences would be destroyed. Thus the sense of the verbal suffix is not to be considered as connected with the sense of the word "not", as in that case the passage could not be understood as expressing a thing to be done. For a "not" of that kind (i. e. a "not" connected with the sense of the verbal suffix) would express only a turning away (from some action) which is the contrary of the instigation conveyed by an injunction; and such a turning away does not express something to be done. Therefore in the sentence "he is not to look at the rising sun" the word "not" expresses by indication (lakshaṇá) the vow of not-looking which is the opposite of what is expressed by the root (in íksheta); for not-looking may be taken as something to be done. So that the whole sentence has to be explained as follows "he is to effect (bhávayet) by means of the resolution of not-looking which (resolution) has for its object the sun. And if it is asked "what is he to effect thereby?" the destruction of evil which is intimated by the complementary sentence "from so much sin he becomes separated" connects itself (with the bháyaná) as the thing to be effected. And in this manner the syntactical unity of the former and the latter sentences (which was spoken of above) is established.—Nor must here the objection be raised that there is no reason for the resolution of not-looking only being connected with the bhávaná as there are different other things which are opposite to the sense of the root; for these different other things are not things (or "the things") to be done and can therefore in the case under consideration not be connected with the bhávaná.(1)

(1) The commentary on this passage runs as follows: But as many things might be done contrary to the looking which is the sense of the root how is it that with regard

The second (kind of obstacle to the negative particle being connected with the verb) applies to passages as the following one "he is to say ye yajámahe at (the biginning of) all yájyás, not at the anuyájas." For here too we must assume a prohibition of the kind called paryudása as otherwise there would be the probability of an option (optional procedure, vikalpa). The reason for this is as follows. If in the quoted passage the verbal suffix were connected with what is expressed by the particle "not", the mantra "ye yajámahe" would be prohibited in the case of the anuyájas, the sense being "at the anuyájas he is not to say ye yajámahe." But a prohibition (pratishedha) must be preceded by an establishment (by some means or other, of what is prohibited) as only a matter previously established can be prohibited. This establishment can only be found in the scriptural passage "he is to say ye yajámahe at the yájyás" (for there is no other means by which the employment of this mantra could be established). But if something previously established by a scriptural passage is prohibited, (by another scriptural passage) only option (vikalpa) can take place and not complete sublation (bádha) (of the former passage by the latter) because the scriptural passage on which it (i. e. the employment of the mantra) bases is not capable of complete sublation by means of another scriptural passage as this is the case with passion forming the base of the establishment (of some act.—Passion may instigate a man to the murder of a Bráhmaṇa which latter act is therefore said to be established by passion; here however scriptural passages like "a bráhmaṇa is not to be killed" step in

to the quoted passage the resolution of not looking alone is accepted as capable of being the instrument of the bhávaná ?—The answer to this objection is: Although different other things as f. i. covering the eyes with a cloth might be considered as being the opposites of the looking which is the sense of the root, nevertheless, the sentence not conveying the idea of any particular energy of the body or of speech while at the same time mental activity is not prohibited, there is left only a particular mental energy viz. the resolution of n t looking (as the instrument of the bhávaná). The reason for this is given in the clause of the text "for these etc." Because these different other things as f. i. covering the eyes with a cloth can not be meant as that which is to be done, only something else opposite to the looking which is the sense of the root and extending to all actions is fit to be connected with the bhávaná. For this reason the resolution of not looking which is opposite to the sense of the root is fit to be connected with the bhávaná as it (viz. the resolution) extends to all actions.

and by their superior authority completely sublate the dictates of passion. On the other hand one scriptural passage can not completely sublate another as it has no claims to superior authority).—Nor must it be objected that as the general scriptural passage "the oblation is made into the áhavaníya-fire" is sublated by the special passage "he is to make the oblation on the foot-print", in the same way the passage "not at the anuyájas" sublates the preceding passage "he says ye yajámahe at the yájyás"; for only such scriptural passages as are independent of each other stand in the relation of that which is sublated and that which sublates. For the quoted passage about the homa to be made on the footprint does not, in order to enjoin its purport, stand in need of the passage about the áhavaníya and is therefore independent. But in the case under consideration the prohibitory passage (na anuyájeshu) stands, in order that the thing to be prohibited may be established, in need of the preceding passage "he is to say the ye yajámahe at the yájyás" and is therefore not independent. For this reason in the case of a thing enjoined by one scriptural passage being prohibited by another only option (vikalpa) is possible (and not complete sublation of one rule by another). But to assume option is not proper, because its consequence is the partial non-authoritativeness of scriptural passages. For if the ye-yajámahe is employed with the anuyájas the authoritativeness of the clause "not with the anuyájas" is not upheld, in the same way as the authoritativeness of the passage enjoining the use of barley for the sacrifice is not upheld when the sacrifice is performed with rice. Moreover the assumption of vikalpa would involve the assumption of a double unseen result as the injunction as well as the prohibition are for the benefit of man (purushártha.—The employment or non-employment of the ye-yajámahe do not contribute anything towards the svarúpa of the sacrifice, are not kratvartha; an adṛishṭa has therefore to be assumed as the result of each). For these reasons the passage under consideration can not be explained as containing a pratishedha (where "not" negatives the verb) but we must consider "na" as connected with the word "anuyájas" and take the passage as a paryudása. So that the proper understanding of the sense of the passage is as follows "he is to use the

mantra ye-yajámahe with the yájyás other than anuyájas", as the particle "na" conveys by indication the notion of (those yájyás) which are different from the anuyájas. And thus option has not to be admitted. And this sentence (i. e. the sentence constructed out of the words na anuyájeshu viz. "he is to use the ye-yajámahe with the yájyás other than anuyájas") does not enjoin the use of the ye-yajámahe as the latter is already established by the preceding clause, viz. "he is to use the ye-yajámahe with the yájyás", but merely enjoins with reference to (as an anuváda to) the ye-yajámahe already established by a general text its (the ye-yajámahe's) belonging to those yájyás which are other than anuyájas. So that the sense of the sentence is "the ye-yajámahe which is uttered with the yájyás is to be uttered with those only which are other than anuyájas." But—it might be objected—according to the above explanation a paryudása-prohibition would not be different from a so-called upasaṃhára whose purport is to restrict to some particular case something established by a scriptural passage of general application.—To this we reply that it is not so. For an upasaṃhára has the purport of restricting to that only (i. e. to that which is mentioned in the upasaṃhára-passage); as f. i. the fourfold division (of the sacrificial cake) which is established by the general text "he is to divide the cake into four parts" is restricted to the ágneya puroḍáśa exclusively by the special text "he is to divide the ágneya puroḍáśa into four parts." A paryudása on the other hand has the purport of restricting something generally established exclusively to what is different from the special thing (mentioned in the paryudása.) Thus it appears that paryudása and upasaṃhára are different.—Sometimes, no other possibility being left, a simple pratishedha has to be accepted although thereby the probability of a vikalpa arises. Thus f. i. although from the prohibition of the taking of the shoḍaśin-cup which (prohibition) is established by the passage "at the atirátra he is not to take the shoḍaśin-cup" the probability of a vikalpa arises (i. e. the optional taking or not-taking of the shoḍaśin-cup at the atirátra), nevertheless the passage can not be taken as a paryudása (whereby option would be precluded) because this is impossible. For the following reasons. If the word "not" were connected

with the word "the shoḍaśin-cup", the sense of the passage would be "at the atirátra he is to take the cups other than the shoḍaśin"; but such an interpretation is impossible as it would be in open conflict with the express injunction contained in the other passage "at the atirátra he is to take the shoḍaśin." If on the other hand the word "not" were connected with the atirátra the sense of the passage would be "he is to take the shoḍaśin at the sacrifices other than the atirátra" and this explanation again is impossible as it would be in conflict with the injunction of the shoḍaśin (for the atirátra). For these reasons, no other possibility being left, the passage can only be explained as a prohibition of the taking of the shoḍaśin-cup which is established by another scriptural passage. And to this explanation it must not be objected that it involves a vikalpa, because a vikalpa too is to be acknowledged (under certain circumstances). The following difference (between the several cases where a pratishedha has to be acknowledged) is however to be noted. In the case of a pratishedha of one thing arising from vikalpa (in the case of one thing established by some scriptural passage being prohibited by some other scriptural passage enjoining the contrary) the thing prohibited is not the cause of any disadvantage (anartha) because in that case the injunction as well as the prohibition are merely for the sacrifice's sake (kratvartha; not purushártha.—In the example given above the taking as well as the not taking of the shoḍaśin are kratvartha, contribute to the outward form of the sacrifice). On the other hand in those cases where there is no vikalpa and the establishment (of what is subsequently prohibited by a scriptural passage) bases on the natural passion of man only, and the prohibition is for the sake of man, there the thing prohibited is the cause of disadvantage as f. i. the eating of kalañja which is prohibited by the passage "he is not to eat kalañja"; for here only the prohibition of eating is for the sake of man.—Nor is it to be objected that in the same way a vikalpa would result from the prohibition of things established by scripture as giving, making offerings etc. which prohibition is contained in the passage "the man who has undergone initiation is not to give, not to make offerings etc."; for in this case although the prohibition of giving, offering etc. which things are of their own

nature for the purpose of man is not for the purpose of man the forbidden thing is the cause of disadvantage to man. The reason of this is that the prohibition of these things being for the purpose of the sacrifice they (i. e. giving, offering etc. if done by the díkshita) would destroy the power of the sacrifice. An analogous case is presented by the prohibition of approaching one's wife at the proper season (approaching one's wife at the ṛitu is generally enjoined but would in spite of that be a cause of disadvantage to the díkshita because it would destroy the efficacy of the sacrifice). (The result of which is that in the two last mentioned cases there is no opening for vikalpa).

Sentences whose purport is either praise (glorification) or blame are called arthaváda. Such sentences effect a matter with a purpose by indication (lakshaṇá; the sentences taken by themselves not being able to effect any purpose). For the arthaváda-sentences, there being no purpose in their conveying merely their own sense, by indication convey praise or blame of matters to be enjoined or prohibited, as they would be open to the reproach of purposelessness if their only object were (to convey) their own sense. (This latter statement is based on the sútra I. 2. 1.) "on account of the (whole) veda referring to actions" (if the arthaváda-passages were taken as merely intimating their own sense without being connected with the passages expressive of injunctions and prohibitions they would be purposeless as the whole Veda avowedly refers to actions, things to be done. The arthavádas are therefore to be taken as containing praise or blame of the actions enjoined or prohibited in the vidhi-and nishedha-passages). Nor is it possible to assume purposelessness (of the arthaváda-passages), as the latter is rendered impossible by the arthavádas being comprised in the injunction of study contained in the passage "svádhyayo' dhyetavyaḥ" which gives to understand that the whole Veda is to be studied and notifies the whole veda's effecting matters having a purpose.

Arthaváda-passages are of two different kinds being either complements of vidhi-passages or complements of nishedha-passages. Thus the passage "Váyu indeed is the swiftest divinity etc."—which forms a complement of the injunctive passage "he who is desirous of prosperity is to offer a white animal to Váyu etc."—has the purpose of intimating a glorification of the matter enjoined. On the other hand the passage "he howled; that he howled (arodít) that is Rudra's Rudratva etc."—which forms a complement to the prohibitory passage "silver is not to be given on the sacrificial grass etc."—has a purpose by intimating the blameworthiness of the matter prohibited.—Nor must one raise the objection that the arthaváda-passages are (nevertheless) purposeless because the idea of praiseworthiness or blameworthiness is of no practical use. For these ideas have a decided use because they promote the activity of man who from laziness or other reasons does not set to work (to perform what is enjoined in the vidhi-passages.)

Again arthaváda is of three different kinds as it is said in the śloka "in case of contradiction it is guṇaváda; in case of asseveration it is anuváda; in case of the absence of both it is bhútárthaváda; thus arthaváda is of three different kinds." The sense of this śloka is as follows. An arthaváda is guṇaváda i. e. statement of some quality, if it contradicts some other means of proof. As f. i. the passage "Áditya (the sun) is yúpa (the sacrificial post)." There as the sameness of the yúpa and the sun is contradicted by perception, the passage establishes by indication (lakshaṇá) the quality (of the yúpa) being shining like the sun.—Arthaváda if conveying a sense already established by another means of proof is called anuváda, reiterative statement. As f. i. the passage "Agni (the fire) is a remedy against cold"; for here the quality of fire being opposite to cold is already known from sensual perception.—A statement conveying something which is neither established by another means of proof nor in conflict with such a one is called a bhútárthaváda, a statement regarding something which has happened. As f. i. the passage "Indra raised the thunderbolt against Vṛitra."

Thus we have established that the entire veda which consists of sentences like "he who is desirous of paradise is to sacrifice etc." immediately or mediately effects duty (dharma) consisting in sacrifices etc. Such (acts of) duty if done with a view to that (result) with a view to which they are enjoined are the cause of that particular result; if done with the intention of making of them an offering to God (íśvara) they are the cause of the highest beatitude.

Nor can it be said that there is no authority for performing such acts with the intention of making of them an offering to God; for the following passage of the Bhagavadgítá furnishes the required authority "whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you sacrifice, whatever you give, whatever you do in way of penance, Kaunteya, do it all as an offering to me." And the authoritativeness of Smṛiti is established in the páda treating of Smṛiti (I. 3.) by the argument of its being based on Śruti.

For the easy understanding of young students the wise Bháskara has composed this succinet compendium of the subjects treated in the Jaiminíya-Śástra.

Herewith is finished the compendium of the Púrva-Mímáṃsá which is entitled "Artha-saṃgraha" and which was composed by Mahopádhyáya Laugákshi Bháskara.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Transl. p. 1. l. 22: so that the beginning aphorism (i. e. the first aphorism of the Mímáṃsá-darśana) means etc.

P. 6. l. 12 after "material" add: so that, by means of the possessive indication contained in the word soma, the sense of the sentence is "he is to effect the desired result by means of the sacrifice distinguished by soma."

P. 48. l. 10: succinct.